

ment, and restoration of conditions existing June 30, 1932; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1432. Also, petition of Charles D. McCoy Camp, No. 28, Department of Indiana, Vincennes, Ind., favoring the repeal of the Economy Act with reference to the veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1433. Also, petition of the Carbon Dioxide Institute, Inc., New York City, opposing the existing tax on carbonic gas used for carbonating beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1434. Also, petition of Recovery Associates of Woodhaven, 78-01 Jamaica Avenue, Woodhaven, Long Island, N.Y., heartily endorsing, favoring, and commending the efforts of the President to bring about necessary changes in our monetary system in the interest of the common good; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1435. Also, petition of Welch, Holme & Clark Co., Inc., opposing the passage of the Tugwell bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1436. Also, petition of F. N. Burt Co., Ltd., Buffalo, N.Y., opposing the so-called "Tugwell bills"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1437. Also, petition of Malcolm D. Gray, 1910 Glenwood Road, Brooklyn, N.Y., opposing the passage of the so-called "Tugwell bill"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1438. Also, petition of the Baker Castor Oil Co., New York City, opposing the passage of Senate bill 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1439. Also, petition of the State of New York Conservation Department, Albany, N.Y., favoring the passage of House Resolution 173, providing for the creation of a new House committee to which would be referred House bills pertaining to fish and game; to the Committee on Rules.

1440. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Matawan, N.J., approving the construction of the proposed ship canal across the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1441. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of W. J. Hutchison and other Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Economy.

1442. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ignacio Rosario et al., regarding the safety, comfort, etc., of the citizens of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1443. Also, petition of Addie L. Robinson, T. Calvin Crenshaw, et al., regarding an inquiry into the infringement of patent rights of the aforementioned petitioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1444. Also, petition of the Pampangan Circle of Chicago, Ill., regarding the reconsideration by Congress of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting bill for modification; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1445. Also, petition of the Teachers' College of Columbia University, regarding the condition of American schools; to the Committee on Education.

1446. Also, petition of Nemesio Y. D. Roca, regarding the independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1447. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Pediatric Society, relative to restrictions based on racial origin imposed on its physicians by the German Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1448. Also, petition of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers, relative to taking an agricultural census for 1925 and each succeeding decade thereafter; to the Committee on the Census.

1449. Also, petition of the Textile Foundation, relative to research work in textile products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1450. Also, petition of Manuel L. Luminario, relative to the extension of the benefits of the Army pension law to the houseboys of American Army officers who served during the Spanish-American War in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Pensions.

1451. Also, petition of the city of Madison, Wis., relative to the issuance of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1452. Also, petition of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting rescinding of act creating stringent regulations for the national soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1453. Also, petition of the Commission Council of the City of New Orleans, La., relative to the granting of Public Works funds for the completion of the industrial canal from the Mississippi River to Lake Pontchartrain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1454. Also, petition of the city of Portland, Oreg., relative to the development of the Columbia River hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1455. Also, petition of the American Medical Association, regarding the construction of new buildings to house the Army medical library and museum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1456. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of New Jersey Bankers Association, for sound currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1457. Also, petition of New Jersey League of Municipalities, urging consideration of the purchase of tax-anticipation or tax-delinquency certificates through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1458. Also, petition of Associated Outdoor Advertisers of New Jersey, protesting against the Tugwell bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1459. Also, joint resolution of New Jersey State Legislature, relative to presence of Dutch elm disease in this country and need for its extermination; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1934

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, who hast clothed the universe with beauty, at whose command the morn doth rise to reawake the world and night descends to deck her brow with stars: Unlock the springs of mind, illumine and purify our souls with inward light that honest thought and reverent speech may here prevail, and crown our day with deeds essential to the Nation's weal.

Bestow on everyone Thy sleepless care; where sorrow dwells, there let Thy dews of mercy fall; and grant that hope and faith triumphant may lead Thy children through the world until the unborn years shall bring the promised day divine. We ask it in the name of Him who is the day-spring from on high, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THOMAS D. SCHALL, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. EDWARD B. ALMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JAMES S. PARKER, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. BOLIVAR E. KEMP, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LYNN S. HORNOR, late a Rep-

representative from the State of West Virginia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN D. CLARKE, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. HENRY W. WATSON, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate resolutions adopted by the House as a tribute to the memory of Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK, late a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

The message also communicated to the Senate resolutions adopted by the House as a tribute to the memory of Hon. PORTER H. DALE, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Costigan	Johnson	Reed
Ashurst	Couzens	Kean	Reynolds
Austin	Cutting	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.
Bachman	Davis	King	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Dickinson	La Follette	Russell
Bankhead	Dieterich	Lewis	Schall
Barbour	Dill	Logan	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	Loneragan	Shipstead
Black	Erickson	Long	Smith
Bone	Fess	McAdoo	Steiwer
Borah	Fletcher	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Frazier	McGill	Thomas, Utah
Bulkeley	George	McKellar	Thompson
Bulow	Gibson	McNary	Townsend
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Trammell
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Gore	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hale	Nye	Van Nuys
Carey	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark	Hastings	Overton	Walcott
Connally	Hatch	Patterson	Walsh
Coolidge	Hayden	Pittman	Wheeler
Copeland	Hebert	Pope	White

Mr. HEBERT. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] are necessarily absent from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the order respecting committee assignments which I present and send to the desk may be entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIETERICH, be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary; that the Senator from New York, Mr. WAGNER, be excused from further service on the Committee on Patents, and that he be assigned to the chairmanship of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys; that the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ADAMS, be assigned to the chairmanship of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation; that the Senator from California, Mr. McADOO, be assigned to service on the Committee on Patents and made chairman thereof; that the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. COOLIDGE, be assigned to service on the Committee on Indian Affairs; that the Senator from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD, be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations; that the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. BACHMAN, be assigned to service on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; that the Senator from Alabama, Mr. BLACK, be assigned to service on the Committee on Printing; that the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. HATCH, be assigned to service on the Committees on Agriculture and For-

estry, Interstate Commerce, Irrigation and Reclamation, Indian Affairs, Privileges and Elections, and Public Lands and Surveys; and that the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY, be assigned to service on the Committees on Appropriations, Post Offices and Post Roads, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, and Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is entered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF FLORAL TRIBUTES TO LATE SENATORS DALE AND KENDRICK

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the families of the late Senators Porter H. Dale, of Vermont, and John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming, expressing their gratitude for and appreciation of the floral tributes sent by the Senate, which were ordered to lie on the table.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Budget for the year ending June 30, 1935. It contains also estimates of receipts and expenditures for the current year ending June 30, 1934, and includes statements of the financial operations or status of all governmental agencies, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The estimates herein given and included in the Budget have to do with general and special funds—the Government's moneys. They do not relate to trust and contributed funds, which are not Government moneys, except where expressly referred to as such.

GENERAL FINANCIAL POSITION

In my annual message to the Congress I have already summarized the problems presented by the deflationary forces of the depression, the paralyzed condition which affected the banking system, business, agriculture, transportation, and, indeed, the whole orderly continuation of the Nation's social and economic system.

I have outlined the steps taken since last March for the resumption of normal activities and the restoration of the credit of the Government.

Of necessity these many measures have caused spending by the Government far in excess of the income of the Government.

The results of expenditures already made show themselves in concrete form in better prices for farm commodities, in renewed business activity, in increased employment, in reopening of and restored confidence in banks, and in well-organized relief.

THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR

(Ending June 30, 1934)

Exclusive of debt retirement of \$488,171,500 for this year, Budget estimates of expenditures, including operating expenses of the regular Government establishments and also all expenditures which may be broadly classed as caused by the necessity for recovery from the depression will amount this year (ending June 30, 1934) to \$9,403,006,967. (See Budget Statement No. 3, table A.)

This total falls in broad terms into the following classifications:

Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1934

General:	
Departmental	\$2,899,116,200
Legislative	17,718,500
Independent establishments	616,857,067
	3,533,691,767
Less public-debt retirements	488,171,500
Total, general	3,045,520,267
Emergency:	
Public Works Administration	1,677,190,800
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	103,250,000
Farm Credit Administration	40,000,000
Emergency Conservation Work	341,705,500
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3,969,740,300

Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1934—Continued

Emergency—Continued	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	\$19,000,000
Federal land banks.....	52,350,000
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	153,000,000
National Industrial Recovery Administration.....	4,250,000
Total, emergency.....	6,357,436,700
Total, general and emergency, less public-debt retirements.....	9,403,006,967

As against these expenditures, which have either been appropriated for or for which appropriations are asked, the estimated receipts for this fiscal year (ending June 30, 1934) are \$3,259,938,756. (See Budget Statement No. 2, table A.)

On this basis, including, however, certain additional expenditures for 1934 which are not included in the Budget estimates but which I believe to be necessary and amounting to \$1,166,000,000 as shown in a subsequent table herein, the excess of expenditures over receipts will be \$7,309,068,211. Interest charges on the borrowings in excess of Budget estimates will slightly increase this figure.

On the basis of these estimates, the public debt, in the strict sense of the term, at the expiration of this fiscal year will therefore amount to approximately \$29,847,000,000, or an increase as shown above of \$7,309,068,211.

However, as against this increase in the total debt figure, it is right to point out that the various governmental agencies have loans outstanding with a book value of \$3,558,516,189 against which collateral or assets have been pledged.

In order to make clear to the Congress what our borrowing problem is for the next 6 months, permit me to remind you that we shall have to borrow approximately \$6,000,000,000 of new money and, in addition, \$4,000,000,000 to meet maturities of a like amount.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1935
(Ending June 30, 1935)

The Budget estimates of expenditures, exclusive of debt retirement of \$525,763,800, and exclusive also of such sum as may be necessary for new and extraordinary recovery purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, amount to \$3,960,798,700.

Again summarizing the main headings of these expenditures they fall into the following items:

Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1935

General:	
Departmental.....	\$3,202,074,900
Legislative.....	18,734,500
Independent establishments.....	542,466,600
	3,763,276,000
Less public-debt retirements.....	525,763,800
Total, general.....	3,237,512,200
Emergency:	
Public Works Administration.....	1,089,883,100
Agricultural Adjustment Administration.....	5,000,000
Emergency conservation work.....	65,190,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	480,436,600
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	31,000,000
Federal land banks.....	12,650,000
Total, emergency.....	723,286,500
Total, general and emergency, less public-debt retirements.....	3,960,798,700

It will be noted that many of these items, such as public works, fall under appropriations made in 1933, the actual expenditures not taking place until after June 30, 1934. (For details of above expenditures see Budget Statement No. 3, table A.)

The above figures do not include additional loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If its loaning authority is extended beyond June 30, 1934, it is contemplated that any additional loans by it would thereafter be taken from the new and additional recovery fund hereinafter referred to.

The estimates of receipts for the next fiscal year (ending June 30, 1935), exclusive of foreign-debt payments, of in-

creased liquor taxes, and of increased revenue flowing from amendments to the existing revenue law, amount to \$3,974,665,479. (See Budget Statement No. 2, table A.)

Therefore, exclusive of debt retirement, these Budget estimates for the next fiscal year show a small surplus of \$13,866,779. But it must be borne in mind that this surplus does not include any additional expenditures for extraordinary recovery purposes.

It is clear that the necessity for relief and recovery will still be with us during the year 1934-35. Additional relief funds will be necessary. Further needs of the country prohibit the abrupt termination of the recovery program. No person can on this date definitely predict the total amount that will be needed, nor the itemizing of such an amount. It is my best judgment at this time that a total appropriation of not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 will, with the expenditures still to be made next year out of existing appropriations, be sufficient.

I shall therefore ask the Congress for appropriations approximating that amount.

This amount is not included in the Budget estimates. If appropriated and expended, therefore, it will change the small estimated surplus of \$13,000,000 into a debt increase of nearly \$2,000,000,000. It is only fair, of course, to say that such a debt increase would be partially offset by loans made against collateral and assets pledged.

Therefore, the total debt, if increased by the sum of \$2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1935, would amount to approximately \$31,834,000,000 on June 30, 1935. It is my belief that so far as we can make estimates with our present knowledge, the Government should seek to hold the total debt within this amount. Furthermore, the Government during the balance of this calendar year should plan to bring its 1936 expenditures, including recovery and relief, within the revenues expected in the fiscal year 1936.

Let me put it another way: The excess of expenditures over receipts during this fiscal year amounts to over \$7,000,000,000. My estimates for the coming fiscal year show an excess of expenditures over receipts of \$2,000,000,000. We should plan to have a definitely balanced Budget for the third year of recovery and from that time on seek a continuing reduction of the national debt.

This excess of expenditures over revenues, amounting to over \$9,000,000,000 during 2 fiscal years, has been rendered necessary to bring the country to a sound condition after the unexampled crisis which we encountered last spring. It is a large amount, but the unmeasurable benefits justify the cost.

The following table shows expenditures and receipts for the fiscal years 1934 and 1935 as contained in the Budget, plus the additional expenditures which will be made out of additional authorizations and appropriations here recommended. It shows, also, the estimated increase in the public debt and the book value of assets held as security against loans:

	1934	1935	2-year period 1934-35
Receipts ¹	\$3,530,938,756	\$3,974,665,479	\$7,234,604,235
Expenditures (exclusive of debt retirement):			
General.....	2,530,720,267	2,486,768,200	5,017,488,467

¹ These estimates of receipts are predicated on Federal Reserve Board average index of industrial production of 81 for fiscal year 1934 and of 98 for the fiscal year 1935.

	Calendar year average	Fiscal year average
1929.....	119	118
1930.....	96	110
1931.....	81	87
1932.....	64	70
1933.....	76	67
1934.....	85	81
1935.....		98

* Partially estimated.
* Estimated.

¹ Excess of credits—deduct.

	1934	1935	2-year period 1934-35
Expenditures (exclusive of debt retirement):—Continued.			
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	\$514,800,000	\$750,744,000	\$1,265,544,000
Emergency ¹	6,357,486,700	723,286,500	7,080,773,200
Additional expenditures from additional appropriations	9,403,006,967	3,960,798,700	13,363,805,667
Total expenditures	1,166,000,000	2,000,000,000	3,166,000,000
Increase in debt ²	10,569,006,967	5,960,798,700	16,529,805,667
Estimated book value of assets held as security for loans	7,309,068,211	1,956,133,221	9,295,201,432
			5,461,969,273

¹ These include net expenditures after deducting Reconstruction Finance Corporation repayments in 1935 of \$480,436,600.

² This figure does not include contingent liabilities such as Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures issued to banks and other institutions.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Budget estimates of appropriations for 1935, exclusive of Agricultural Adjustment Administration benefit payments and refunds of processing taxes, but inclusive of all other appropriations for regular departments and independent establishments including interest on the debt and debt retirement are \$2,980,293,833.60. When compared with Budget estimates of appropriations transmitted in the Budget for 1934 they show a reduction of \$684,913,167.

A tabular comparative summary of receipts, estimates, appropriations, and expenditures, classified according to general and emergency items and listed by departments and under other general heads, appears in Budget Statement No. 1, table B.

TAXES

The estimates of receipts take no account of the additional revenue which may be obtained from an increase in liquor taxes and from the proposed changes in the income-tax law. Since neither of these tax measures has come before Congress as yet, no accurate estimate can be made of their yield. However, if, as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax on distilled spirits is increased from \$1.10 a gallon to \$2 a gallon, and the rates of tax on wines are also increased, the estimated revenue would be increased by approximately \$50,000,000, assuming that consumption is not affected by additional gallonage taxes imposed by the States. Considerable additional revenue can also be secured from administrative changes in the income-tax law, which may amount to as much as \$150,000,000 for a full year.

The estimates for the Post Office Department are predicated upon a continuation of the 3-cent postal rate for nonlocal mail. It is highly important that this rate be continued. I recommend its continuance.

ECONOMY LEGISLATION

The estimates of appropriations submitted in the Budget are predicated on the continuation of certain economy legislative provisions which I ask to be enacted and which are appended hereto. The most important is that having to do with reduction of compensation of Federal employees. It is eminently fair that, the cost of living having fallen as compared with 1928, the employees of the Government sustain some reduction in compensation. This is not inconsistent with our policy of advocating an increase in wages in industry. For wages there had fallen far beyond any reduction contemplated for Federal employees and in most grades are even now substantially below compensation paid Federal employees under the maximum reduction of 15 percent.

Among the legislative provisions appended hereto is one prohibiting automatic increases in compensation except in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The personnel of these three services are engaged in a life service to their country. Some, by reason of the pay freezes, have sustained reduction in compensation of more than 25 percent. They are, therefore, in a different category from those in other governmental agencies. They should, in 1935, be released from the restrictions on automatic increases in compensation.

CONTROL

Up to now there has been no coordinated control over emergency expenditures. Today, by Executive order, I have imposed that necessary control in the Bureau of the Budget.

Heretofore, emergency expenditures have not been subject to audit by the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office. Today I am, by Executive order, reposing in him the authority to conduct such an audit and to continue to audit each such expenditure. Hereafter, therefore, just as in the departmental expenditures, there will be, in emergency expenditures, a pre-Budget and a post audit.

By reason of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has had no control in the past over the various expenditures, obligations, and allotments made by the emergency organizations, the task of preparing the present Budget has been the most difficult one since the Budget and Accounting Act went into effect in 1921. These difficulties, in future years, will be substantially minimized by the control which I have established.

It is evident to me, as I am sure it is evident to you, that powerful forces for recovery exist. It is by laying a foundation of confidence in the present and faith in the future that the upturn which we have so far seen will become cumulative. The cornerstone of this foundation is the good credit of the Government.

It is, therefore, not strange nor is it academic that this credit has a profound effect upon the confidence so necessary to permit the new recovery to develop into maturity.

If we maintain the course I have outlined, we can confidently look forward to cumulative beneficial forces represented by increased volume of business, more general profit, greater employment, a diminution of relief expenditures, larger governmental receipts and repayments, and greater human happiness.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 3, 1934.

ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENT OF APPROPRIATION ESTIMATES FOR THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress, pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 2, 1933 (Public 410, 72d Cong.), an alternate arrangement of the estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1935.

The details of this alternate arrangement of the estimates are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which is transmitted herewith, and with which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 3, 1934.

[NOTE.—The alternate arrangement accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules and lists of useless papers and documents in the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of the current business of the Department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred

to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. HARRISON and Mr. REED as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the reports submitted by the executive departments and independent establishments, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, showing the number of vacant positions therein, the number filled, and the amounts unexpended for the period between July 1, 1933, and October 31, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, chairman of the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the year ended September 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S.DOC. NO. 106)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, as ex officio president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

SPECIAL RAILWAY MAIL TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relative to special contracts made with the following railroad companies for the transportation of the mails: Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co., between Hudson Terminal Station, New York, N.Y., and Journal Square, Jersey City, N.J.; Rio Grande Southern Railroad Co., Victor A. Miller, receiver, between Ridgway and Durango, Colo.; and Colorado & Southern Railway Co., between Denver and Leadville, Colo., which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers and documents in the files of the Post Office Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the Department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. SCHALL as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

AIRCRAFT PURCHASED FOR THE NAVY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, the prices paid therefor, and the reason for the award in each case, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT OF WAR MINERALS RELIEF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the War Minerals Relief Commission for the year ended November 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

CANCELATIONS OF INDIAN INDEBTEDNESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two letters from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of cancellations and adjustments of reimbursable charges of the United States existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR EXPERIMENTATION ACTIVITIES (S.DOC. NO. 102)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 101, agreed to June 12, 1933, a report relative to personnel reductions and curtailed activities of the Geological Survey, Office of Education, National Park Service, and the Virgin Islands, in connection with scientific research and experimentation, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR EXPERIMENTATION ACTIVITIES (S.DOC. NO. 105)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 101, agreed to June 12, 1933, a report relative to personnel reductions and curtailed activities in connection with scientific research and experimentation conducted by the Department of Agriculture, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, as ex officio Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SETTLEMENT OF SHIPPING BOARD CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1932, to October 15, 1933, by the United States Shipping Board Bureau and United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT KEY WEST, FLA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Commerce to exchange a portion of the naval station and a portion of the lighthouse reservation at Key West, Fla., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INCOME, 1929-32

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 220, Seventy-second Congress, a report on the national income, 1929-32, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the operations of the United States Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, and the calendar year 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF BELLEAU WOOD MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the honorary President of the Belleau Wood Memorial Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the association for the year ended December 31, 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF TEXTILE FOUNDATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Textile Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings, activities, income, and expenditures of the corporation for the year ended December 31, 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the year ended October 31, 1933, except as otherwise noted, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN RAILROAD PROPERTIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, final valuations of properties of the St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Co. and 84 other railway companies, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Director General, United States Railroad Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers and documents in the files of the Administration which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. DILL and Mr. COUZENS as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a preliminary report of the activities of the Farm Credit Administration to December 31, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President and Chairman of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Institute for the year ended October 31, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

WILLIAM E. B. GRANT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of an examination of the claim of William E. B. Grant, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL HAND TOOLS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 295, Seventy-first Congress, copy of a report of an investigation by the Commission with respect to agricultural hand tools, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

COTTON VELVETS AND VELVETEENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 440, Seventy-first Congress, copy of a report of an investigation by the Commission with respect to cotton velvets and velveteens, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SYNTHETIC CAMPHOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copy of a report made by the Commission with respect to synthetic camphor conducted in accordance with a special provision in paragraph 51 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

DUTIES COLLECTED ON IMPORTS FROM PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a statistical report entitled "Computed Duties and Equivalent Ad Valorem Rates on Imports into the United States from Principal Countries, 1931", which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

METHODS OF VALUATION FOR TARIFF PURPOSES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a report sent to the President by the Commission in an investigation with respect to methods of valuation, in accordance with the provisions of section 642 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RUSSIAN ASBESTOS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a report sent to the President by the Commission in an investigation, for the purposes of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to Russian asbestos, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

DUTIES ON FISH IN OIL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a report sent to the President by the Commission in an investigation, for the purposes of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to fish in oil, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventeenth annual report of the Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933,

which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ANNUAL REPORT OF BOARD OF MEDIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Board of Mediation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRACTICE OF THE HEALING ARTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing officers of the Government who were delinquent in rendering or transmitting their accounts to the proper officers in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S.DOC. NO. 101)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 2, 1933, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS ENTERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S.DOC. NO. 104)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of judgments entered by the court in the following cases referred to the court by the Senate under the Judicial Code: Farmers & Ginners Cotton Oil Co., Hodgson Oil Refining Co., Planters Cotton Oil Co., Brookhaven Cotton Oil & Fertilizer Co., Planters Manufacturing Co., and Buckeye Cotton Oil Co., which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM WRIGLEY, JR., CO. (S.DOC. NO. 103)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the special findings of fact, conclusions of law, and opinions of the court in the case of William Wrigley, Jr., Co., referred to the court by the Senate under the Judicial Code, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL CASES DISMISSED BY COURT OF CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, advising the Senate that the cases of Louis Nixon, Maryland Iron Works, and Columbia Iron Works & Dry Dock Co., of Baltimore, Md., which were referred to the court by the Senate were dismissed for want of prosecution, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate two letters from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, stating that the claims of W. R. Trigg and James L. Vai, which were referred to the court by the Senate, had been dismissed on the motions of plaintiffs, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO CHILD LABOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of Illinois, transmitting copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Illinois relating to the ratification of the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, August 18, 1933.

The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have the honor to enclose herewith certified copy of House Joint Resolution No. 46 of the General Assembly of Illinois, relating to the ratification of the joint resolution of both Houses of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States, granting Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

Respectfully,

HENRY HORNER, Governor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, Greeting:

I, Edward J. Hughes, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of House Joint Resolution No. 46, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois.

Done at the city of Springfield, this 16th day of August, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

EDWARD J. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution No. 46

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two thirds thereof, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America which should be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the States, which resolution is in words and figures following, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article, except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring herein),

SECTION 1. That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D.C., to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted by the house June 30, 1933.

ARTHUR ROE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CHAS. P. CASEY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate June 30, 1933.

THOMAS F. DONOVAN,
President of the Senate.
A. E. EDEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of Iowa transmitting copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa relating to the ratification of the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Des Moines, December 19, 1933.

HON. JOHN N. GARNER,

Vice President, Washington, D.C.:

SIR: I am herewith enclosing a certified copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, by which a proposed amendment to the Con-

stitution of the United States of America, relative to the labor of persons under 18 years of age was ratified by the State of Iowa, December 5, 1933.

Yours very truly,

CLYDE L. HERRING, Governor.

STATE OF IOWA,
SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Mrs. Alex Miller, secretary of state of the State of Iowa and custodian of the acts and resolutions of the General Assembly of Iowa, do hereby certify that the attached instrument is a true and correct copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, by which a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, relative to the labor of persons under 18 years of age has been ratified by the State of Iowa.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 12th day of December 1933.

[SEAL]

Mrs. ALEX MILLER,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, relative to the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved and enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as set forth herein be and the same is hereby ratified and consented to by the State of Iowa and by the general assembly thereof.

SEC. 2. Be it further resolved and enacted, That copies of this enactment and resolution, certified by the secretary of state, be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States at Washington, D.C., and to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

N. G. KRASCHEL,
President of the Senate.
GEO. E. MILLER,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that this senate joint resolution originated in the senate and is known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, forty-fifth general assembly in extraordinary session.

BYRON G. ALLEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of state of the State of Maine transmitting copy of a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine ratifying the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, December 19, 1933.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of a resolve of the Eighty-sixth Legislature of the State of Maine ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Congress to regulate child labor.

Very respectfully yours,

ROBINSON C. TOBEY,
Secretary of State of the State of Maine.

STATE OF MAINE,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robinson C. Tobey, secretary of state, certify that the paper to which this is attached is a true copy from the records of this office.

In testimony whereof I have caused the great seal of the State to be hereunto affixed. Given under my hand at Augusta this 19th day of December, A.D. 1933, and in the one hundred and

fifty-eighth year of the independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL]

ROBINSON C. TOBEY,
Secretary of State.

Resolve, Ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Congress to regulate child labor.

Whereas the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at the city of Washington, in December 1923, on June 2, 1924, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses, adopted the following joint resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the text of which resolution is as follows, to wit:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolve.

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 16, 1933.

Read and passed finally.

FRANZ U. BURKETT, Speaker.

IN SENATE,
December 16, 1933.

Read and passed finally.

HAROLD H. MURCHIE, President.

Approved December 16, 1933.

LOUIS J. BRANN, Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, ratifying the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Mike Holm, Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy with record of the original instrument in my office of house file no. 27, being resolution no. 2, special session of 1933, and that said copy is a true and correct transcript of said instrument and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol in St. Paul, this 15th day of December, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

MIKE HOLM, Secretary of State.

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session thereof, by a joint resolution, a two-thirds majority of each House concurring therein, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which resolution reads as follows, to wit:

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislature of three fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

Sec. 2. That the secretary of state be and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and that he transmit official notice hereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, as provided by the law of this State.

CHAS. MUNN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
K. K. SOLBERG,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 13th day of December 1933.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.
Passed the senate the 14th day of December 1933.
G. H. SPAETH, Secretary of the Senate.
Approved: December 14, 1933.

FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.
Filed: December 14, 1933.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota ratifying the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Robert Byrne, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. H of the Twenty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota has been compared by me with the original Senate Concurrent Resolution No. H on file in this department, and that the same is a true copy thereof, and of the whole of such instrument.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Bismarck, this 9th day of August, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

ROBERT BYRNE,
Secretary of State.
By CHARLES LESSMAN,
Deputy.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. H (introduced by Senator Stucke)

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at the city of Washington on Monday, the 3d day of December, A.D. 1923, by a constitutional majority of two thirds thereof, made and passed a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, which joint resolution was duly ratified by Congress and approved by the President of the United States on or about the 6th day of June, A.D. 1924.

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota duly convened, That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State for the United States of America at Washington, D.C., and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress.

Filed in this office this 4th day of March 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma ratifying the so-called "child labor amendment" to the Constitution, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, R. A. Sneed, secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true

copy of enrolled House Joint Resolution No. 2 (by Abernathy (Pott.), Munson, Billings, Logsdon, Graham, Sutherland, Strickland (Pontotoc), and Singleton), a resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age, and declaring an emergency, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of State. Done at the city of Oklahoma City this 11th day of July, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

R. A. SNEED,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 2 (by Abernathy (Pott.), Munson, Billings, Logsdon, Graham, Sutherland, Strickland (Pontotoc), and Singleton)

A resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age and declaring an emergency

Whereas the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

"SEC. 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article, except that the organization of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to the legislation enacted by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fourteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma in extraordinary session assembled:

SECTION 1. That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, as set forth in the preamble hereto, is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

SEC. 2. Certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

SEC. 3. It being immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, and safety, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, by reason whereof this resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval.

Passed the house of representatives the 29th day of June 1933.

Passed the senate the 5th day of July 1933.

R. R. FITZGERALD,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
ROBERT BURNS,
President of the Senate

Approved by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma the — day of —, 1933.

Correctly enrolled.

NAT HENDERSON,
Acting Chairman Committee on
Enrolled and Engrossed Bills.

REPEAL OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado ratifying the amendment to the Constitution repealing the eighteenth amendment thereto, which was ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Colorado ss:

I, Chas. M. Armstrong, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of the resolution adopted by a convention held in the State of Colorado, and called in accordance with the provisions of chapter 7 of the laws passed at the extraordinary session of the Twenty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment thereto, which was filed in my office on the 9th day of October, A.D. 1933, at the hour of 2 p.m. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado, at the city of Denver, this 9th day of October, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

CHAS. M. ARMSTRONG,
Secretary of State.

Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment thereto

Whereas the Seventy-second Congress of the United States of America at the second session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Monday the 5th day of December 1932, did pass the following resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

"JNO. N. GARNER,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"CHARLES CURTIS,

"Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate."

And

Whereas there was duly transmitted to the general assembly of this State the said article of amendment proposed by the Congress to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the general assembly of this State, pursuant to law, did enact an act entitled "An act to provide for a convention to act upon the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment", which said act, having passed both houses of the general assembly, was approved by the Governor of this State on August 10, 1933, and constitutes chapter 7 of the Session Laws of Colorado, extraordinary session, 1933; and

Whereas, pursuant to the provisions of said act of the general assembly, an election for the selection of delegates to the said convention was duly held on September 12, 1933, at which said election delegates were chosen in accordance with the provisions of said act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the convention of delegates duly elected and assembled this 26th day of September 1933 in the senate chamber at the State capitol, in the city and county of Denver, State of Colorado, and duly organized pursuant to law, That said proposed article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by this convention; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary of this convention shall certify the result of the votes of the delegates to the secretary of state of this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of this State shall certify the result of this vote to the Secretary of State of the United States in the manner in which amendments to the Constitution of the United States submitted to the legislature for ratification are certified.

We recommend adoption of the foregoing.

HARRY LUBERC, Chairman.

NORMA WASON DODGE,

EDWARD D. NICHOLSON,

W. W. GRANT, Jr.,

Constituting the Resolutions Committee.

DENVER, COLO.

To CHARLES M. ARMSTRONG,

Secretary of State of the State of Colorado.

We, Spencer Penrose and Anna Lou P. Boettcher, respectively president and secretary of the convention called for the purpose of acting upon the ratification of the proposed amendment for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, do hereby certify that the foregoing is the original copy of the resolution adopted by the State convention ratifying the proposed amendment providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

We do further certify that the said resolution was adopted by a vote of 15 for the adoption of the resolution and none against the adoption of the resolution, the same being the unanimous vote of the delegates to the convention in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands this 26th day of September, A.D. 1933.

SPENCER PENROSE,

President of the Convention.

ANNA LOU P. BOETTCHER,

Secretary of the Convention.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following documents, transmitted by the secretary of state

of the State of Connecticut, pertaining to the ratification of the amendment to the Constitution repealing the eighteenth amendment thereto, which were ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Office of the Secretary, ss:

I, John A. Danaher, secretary of the State of Connecticut and keeper of the seal thereof, do hereby certify that the copies hereto attached are true copies of special acts of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut passed at its January session 1933 and respectfully numbered and entitled as follows:

"No. 137. An act providing for a convention to consider the question of the adoption or rejection of an amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment submitted to this State by the Congress of the United States.

"No. 247. An act amending an act providing for a convention to consider the question of the adoption or rejection of an amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment submitted to this State by the Congress of the United States."

I further certify that the copies attached are true copies of the several proclamations issued by His Excellency Wilbur L. Cross, Governor of the State of Connecticut, dated May 6, 1933, designating June 20, 1933, a date for the election of delegates to a convention; and dated June 21, 1933, designating July 11, 1933, a date for the holding of a convention in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol in Hartford.

And I further certify that the copy attached is a true copy of the resolution passed by the convention of delegates held in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol in Hartford on July 11, 1933, pursuant to said special acts and said proclamations.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Connecticut at Hartford this 12th day of July, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER,
Secretary.

An act providing for a convention to consider the question of the adoption or rejection of an amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment, submitted to this State by the Congress of the United States

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives in general assembly convened:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to be valid when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the States, which proposed amendment is as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Now, therefore, to provide for the constitution of such convention in this State, the time and place of holding the same, and the manner of election of delegates thereto,

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives in general assembly convened:

SECTION 1. A convention for the sole purpose of ratifying or rejecting the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States recited in the preamble shall be held in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol at Hartford on such date as shall be fixed by the Governor by proclamation.

SEC. 2. Said convention shall be composed of 50 delegates, 1 to be elected from each senatorial district, and 15 to be elected at large, in the manner hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. The Governor shall, by proclamation, fix a date for the election of such delegates, which date shall be not less than 10 days nor more than 60 days after the final adjournment of the present session of the general assembly. Said proclamation shall be issued at least 6 weeks before such date and shall set forth the manner of and time for nominating such delegates as herein-after provided.

SEC. 4. At said election all persons qualified to vote for members of the general assembly, and who were registered on the revised registry list then last completed according to law, shall be entitled to vote.

SEC. 5. Except as in this act otherwise provided, said election shall be conducted and the results thereof ascertained and certified in the same manner as in the case of the election of Presidential electors in this State, and all provisions of the statutes of this State relative to elections, except so far as inconsistent with this act, are made applicable to said election.

SEC. 6. Each delegate to said convention shall be an elector and resident of the State, and each district delegate shall be a resident of the senatorial district by which he is to be elected. Nominations shall be by petition and not otherwise. Nominating petitions shall be filed with the secretary of the State at least 4 weeks prior to the proclaimed date of the election. Each petition nominating a candidate for a district delegate shall be signed by not less than 100 electors resident within the district, and each petition for delegates at large shall be signed by not less than 500 electors resident within the State. Such petitions shall contain

the name, street, and town address of each signer, and shall be submitted to the town clerks of the towns in which such signers reside at least 1 week prior to the filing thereof, and such town clerks shall certify thereon the electors signing such petitions whose names appear on the voting list last completed in their respective towns. Each petition nominating a district delegate shall state that the nominee is in favor of the proposed amendment, or that he is opposed to the proposed amendment, as the case may be; and each petition nominating delegates at large shall contain the names of 15 candidates, and shall state that all of them are in favor of, or that all of them are opposed to, the proposed amendment, as the case may be. Any person circulating a nominating petition for signature shall leave in the town clerk's office in the town where he is circulating such petition a copy thereof, including the names of the candidates named in such petition, and such petition may be then signed by qualified electors. If more than one petition nominating different candidates for a district delegate in favor of said proposed amendment, or more than one petition nominating different candidates opposed to such proposed amendment, shall be received by the secretary of the State, or more than one petition nominating delegates at large in favor of, or more than one petition nominating delegates at large opposed to, said proposed amendment, shall be received by the secretary of the State, he shall act on the petition containing the largest number of certified signatures, or, in the case of a tie, shall select by lot the petition to be acted upon, and shall disregard the other petitions. If no proper petition be filed nominating candidates favoring ratification or opposing ratification within the time herein provided, the Governor shall nominate such candidates and the candidates so nominated shall be placed upon the ballots or voting machines in the same manner as if regularly nominated by petition.

Sec. 7. The secretary of the State shall then cause to be printed for each senatorial district a sufficient number of ballots. Said ballots shall contain a statement of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, followed by a clear statement of the way in which the voter is to mark the ballot. They shall be arranged in perpendicular columns of equal width, headed, respectively, in plain type, "For Ratification" and "Against Ratification." In the column headed "For Ratification" shall be placed the names of the candidates for delegates at large nominated as in favor of ratification, followed by the name of the candidate for district delegate nominated as in favor of ratification. In the column headed "Against Ratification" shall be placed the names of the candidates for delegates at large nominated as opposed to ratification, followed by the name of the candidate for district delegate nominated as opposed to ratification. At the left of each name shall be a printed square. At the head of each column shall be a circle. To vote for all the candidates in favor of ratification, or to vote for all the candidates opposed to ratification, the voter may make a cross mark in the circle at the head of the list of candidates. Any voter may, if he shall so prefer, make no mark in either circle, and vote for the individual candidates whom he shall prefer, not exceeding 16, making a cross mark in the square at the left of the name of the candidate.

Sec. 8. For use in towns or voting precincts in which the voting machine is used in general elections, the secretary of the State shall cause to be printed a sufficient supply of instructions to voters, giving the text of the proposed amendment, clear instructions to voters, and the names of the candidates arranged in horizontal rows, one row bearing the names of all the candidates in favor of ratification and the other row bearing the names of all the candidates against ratification. The names shall be arranged on the voting machine in the same manner, and the voter may vote for the entire list of candidates for or against ratification, or he may vote for the individual candidates whom he shall prefer, not exceeding 16. The secretary of the State shall determine by lot which list of candidates shall have the upper position on the voting machine or the left-hand position on the ballot.

Sec. 9. The candidate for district delegate who shall receive the highest vote in each senatorial district shall be a delegate to the convention and the 15 candidates for delegates at large who shall receive the highest number of votes shall also be delegates. If in any district there shall be a tie, there shall be no delegate from that district, and the total membership of the convention shall be correspondingly reduced. If there shall be a failure to choose 15 delegates at large because of a tie, only the delegates who have a plurality of votes shall be elected, and the total number of delegates shall be correspondingly reduced.

Sec. 10. The secretary of the State shall canvass the returns of the election, and shall cause the list of delegates elected to be published as soon as the result shall be ascertained.

Sec. 11. The convention shall be the judge of the election and qualifications of its members; and shall have power to elect its president, secretary, and other officers, and adopt its own rules. It shall keep a journal of its proceedings, in which shall be recorded the vote of each delegate on the question of ratification of the proposed amendment. Upon final adjournment the journal of the convention shall be filed with the secretary of the State.

Sec. 12. A majority of the elected delegates shall be required to ratify the proposed amendment. A certificate stating whether the convention has ratified or failed to ratify the proposed amendment shall be executed by the president and secretary of the convention and transmitted to the secretary of the State, who shall transmit such certificate under the great seal of the State to the Secretary of State of the United States.

Sec. 13. The delegates shall receive no compensation; but each delegate shall receive an allowance for his travel from his home to the capitol and return, at the same rate as is allowed for members of the general assembly. The comptroller is instructed to draw his order on the treasurer, payable to each delegate who shall attend the convention, for his expenses so determined. The board of finance and control shall determine the expense of preparing the ballots and other expenses incurred by the secretary of the State in carrying out the provisions of this act, and such expenses, together with any expenses of the convention other than for the travel of delegates shall be paid to the persons designated by the board of finance and control, by the treasurer, upon order of the comptroller. The expenses of the election for the choice of delegates in each town shall be borne by such town.

Sec. 14. If Congress shall hereafter prescribe by statute the manner in which the convention shall be constituted and shall not except from the provisions of such statute such States as may theretofore have provided for constituting such conventions, the preceding provisions of this act shall be inoperative, and the convention of the State of Connecticut shall be constituted and held as such act of Congress shall direct. All officers of the State who may, by such act of Congress, be authorized or directed to take any action to constitute such a convention for this State are authorized to act thereunder and in obedience thereto, in the same manner as if they were so authorized and directed by a statute of this State.

Certified as correct by:

WILLIAM M. HARNEY,
Engrossing Clerk.
ROY C. WILCOX,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM HANNA,
Speaker of the House.

Approved April 10, 1933.

WILEUR L. CROSS, Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Office of the Secretary, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 12th day of July, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER, Secretary.

An act amending an act providing for a convention to consider the question of the adoption or rejection of an amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment submitted to this State by the Congress of the United States

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives in general assembly convened—

Section 10 of no. 137 of the special acts of 1933 is amended to read as follows: "The secretary of the state shall canvass the returns of the election on the first Wednesday of the month following the month in which the election is held, and shall cause the list of delegates elected to be published as soon as the result shall be ascertained."

Certified as correct by

WILLIAM M. HARNEY,
Engrossing Clerk.
ROY C. WILCOX,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM HANNA,
Speaker of the House.

Approved May 5, 1933.

WILEUR L. CROSS, Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Office of the Secretary, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 12th day of July, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER, Secretary.

Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States entitled "Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States"

Whereas the Seventy-second Congress of the United States of America at the second session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Monday, the 5th day of December 1932, by a constitutional majority of two thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of United States

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein

of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

"JNO. N. GARNER,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"CHARLES CURTIS,
"Vice President of the United States and
"President of the Senate."

And

Whereas pursuant to the third section of said joint resolution and the provisions of Special Acts Nos. 137 and 247 of the January 1933 session of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, this convention has assembled in response to the proclamation of his excellency, the Governor of the State of Connecticut, issued under the provisions of said Special Act No. 137: Therefore be it

Resolved by this convention, That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, reading in words as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

be and the same is hereby ratified; be it further

Resolved, That a certificate stating that this convention has ratified the proposed amendment be executed by the president and secretary of the convention and transmitted to the secretary of the State of Connecticut with the request that, pursuant to said Special Act No. 137, the secretary of the State shall attach thereto the great seal of the State of Connecticut and transmit said certificate so sealed to the Secretary of State of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Connecticut to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the State of Connecticut.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Office of the Secretary, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 12th day of July, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER,
Secretary.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

By His Excellency Wilbur L. Cross, Governor

A PROCLAMATION

By virtue of No. 137 of the Special Acts of 1933, as amended, I hereby designate Tuesday, June 20 next, as a date for the election of delegates to a convention to be held in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol at Hartford on a date to be fixed by the Governor by proclamation for the sole purpose of ratifying or rejecting a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides as follows—

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution within 7 years from the date of a submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

At said election 50 delegates shall be chosen, one to be elected from each senatorial district within the State, and 15 to be elected at large in the manner provided in said special act.

Except as otherwise provided in said act, as amended, said election shall be conducted and the results thereof ascertained and certified in the same manner as in the case of the election of Presidential electors in this State, and all provisions of the statutes of this State relative to elections, except so far as inconsistent with said act, are to be applicable to said election.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 6th day of May, A.D. 1933, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-seventh.

WILBUR L. CROSS.

By his excellency's command:

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER, Secretary.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

By His Excellency Wilbur L. Cross, Governor

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas Special Act No. 137 of the January 1933 session of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, entitled "An act providing for a convention to consider the question of the adoption or rejection of an amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment submitted to this State by the Congress of the United States", has been duly passed and is now law; and

Whereas it is provided by said special act that a convention for the sole purpose of ratifying or rejecting the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, recited in the preamble of said act, shall be held in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol at Hartford on such date as shall be fixed by the Governor by proclamation; and

Whereas said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution within 7 years from the date of a submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Now, therefore, I, Wilbur L. Cross, Governor of the State of Connecticut, acting herein by virtue of the authority vested in me by said Special Act No. 137 of the January 1933 session of the general assembly, do hereby proclaim and designate Tuesday, July 11 next, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon, standard time, as the date and hour and the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol at Hartford as the place for the convening and holding of such convention for the purpose of ratifying or rejecting said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed, and have hereunto set my hand, at Hartford, on this 21st day of June, A.D. 1933, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-seventh.

WILBUR L. CROSS.

By his excellency's command:

[SEAL]

JOHN A. DANAHER,
Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate documents transmitted by delegates to the convention for the State of New Mexico certifying to the ratification of the amendment to the Constitution repealing the eighteenth amendment thereto, which were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

SANTA FE, N.MEX., November 3, 1933.

To the honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to chapter 163 of the 1933 Session Laws of the State of New Mexico, and the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, we are transmitting certificate of ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution, and certificate of election of the State canvassing board of the State of New Mexico certifying to the election of the undersigned.

Mrs. FRANKLIN K. LANE,
MIGUEL A. GONZALES,
FRAGER MILLER.

Delegates to the Convention for the State of New Mexico.

CERTIFICATE OF RATIFICATION

We, the undersigned duly elected delegates chosen to vote upon ratification of the proposal of the Congress to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following language, to wit:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

"JNO. N. GARNER,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"CHARLES CURTIS,
"Vice President of the United States and
"President of the Senate."

Do hereby certify that according to law we were elected at the special election called for the purpose of electing delegates for such purpose, on the 19th day of September 1933, and that we met at Santa Fe, N.Mex., in the senate chamber on the 2d day of November 1933, and cast our ballots upon such question of ratification, as follows:

For ratification of said proposed amendment.....	3
Against ratification of said proposed amendment.....	0

We therefore certify that three votes were cast for ratification of the said proposed amendment, and that said amendment is hereby ratified by the State of New Mexico, in and by said convention assembled.

Done this the 2d day of November 1933.

MRS. FRANKLIN K. LANE,
PRAGER MILLER,
MIGUEL A. GONZALES,
Delegates.

THE STATE CANVASSING BOARD OF
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

This is to certify that at a public election held in the State of New Mexico on September 19, 1933, pursuant to chapters 135 and 163 of the Laws of 1933, Mrs. Franklin K. Lane, of Santa Fe County, Santa Fe, N.Mex., was duly elected to the office of delegate to a convention to be held in the senate chamber at the capitol at Santa Fe, N.Mex., upon November 2, 1933, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, for the purpose of ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; she having theretofore filed in the office of secretary of state, pursuant to chapter 163 of the 1933 Session Laws, the following preelection pledge:

Pledge of prospective candidate for delegate to a convention to vote upon the ratification or rejection of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
County of Santa Fe, ss:

Mrs. Franklin K. Lane, being first duly sworn, upon her oath deposes and says that she is a prospective candidate for delegate to the convention called by the Governor of New Mexico for November 2, 1933, which convention is to be held in the senate chamber at the State capitol at Santa Fe, N.Mex., for the purpose of ratifying or rejecting the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, for delivery or use therein, of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by Congress."

That she resides at 520 Camino Del Monte Sol, Santa Fe, N.Mex., and has been a resident of the State of New Mexico for a period of 3 years; that in the event she is elected to the said convention she will vote for the ratification of said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

MRS. FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of April 1933.

[SEAL] JOSE A. BACA, *Notary Public.*
My commission expires February 27, 1937.

In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our hands and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of New Mexico, this 16th day of October, A.D. 1933.

A. W. HOCKENHULL,
Governor of New Mexico.
JOHN C. WATSON,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.
MRS. MARGUERITE P. BACA,
Secretary of State of New Mexico.

THE STATE CANVASSING BOARD
OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

This is to certify that at a public election held in the State of New Mexico on September 19, 1933, pursuant to chapters 135 and 163 of the Laws of 1933, Miguel A. Gonzales, of Rio Arriba County, Abiqui, N.Mex., was duly elected to the office of delegate to a convention to be held in the senate chamber at the capitol in Santa Fe, N.Mex., upon November 2, 1933, at the hour of 12 noon for the purpose of ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, he having theretofore filed in the office of secretary of state, pursuant to chapter 163 of the 1933 Session Laws, the following preelection pledge:

Pledge of prospective candidate for delegate to a convention to vote upon the ratification or rejection of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

County of Santa Fe, ss:

Miguel A. Gonzales, being first duly sworn upon his oath, deposes and says that he is a prospective candidate for delegate to the convention called by the Governor of New Mexico for November 2, 1933, which convention is to be held in the senate chamber at the State capitol at Santa Fe, N.Mex., for the purpose of ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by Congress."

That he resides at Abiqui, N.Mex., and has been a resident of the State of New Mexico for a period of 54 years; that in the event he is elected to the said convention he will vote for the ratification of said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

MIGUEL A. GONZALES.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of April 1933.

[SEAL] JOSE A. BACA, *Notary Public.*
My commission expires February 24, 1937.

In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our hands and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of New Mexico this 16th day of October, A.D. 1933.

A. W. HOCKENHULL,
Governor of New Mexico.
JOHN C. WATSON,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.
MRS. MARGUERITE P. BACA,
Secretary of State of New Mexico.

THE STATE CANVASSING BOARD
OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

This is to certify that at a public election held in the State of New Mexico on September 19, 1933, pursuant to chapters 135 and 163 of the laws of 1933, Prager Miller, of Chaves County, Roswell, N.Mex., was duly elected to the office of delegate to a convention to be held in the senate chamber at the capitol at Santa Fe, N.Mex., upon November 2, 1933, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon for the purpose of ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, he having theretofore filed in the office of secretary of state, pursuant to chapter 163 of the 1933 session laws, the following preelection pledge:

Pledge of prospective candidate for delegate to a convention to vote upon the ratification or rejection of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

County of Santa Fe, ss:

Prager Miller, being first duly sworn, upon his oath deposes and says that he is a prospective candidate for delegate to the convention called by the Governor of New Mexico for November 2, 1933, which convention is to be held in the senate chamber at the State capitol at Santa Fe, N.Mex., for the purpose of ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

That he resides at 609 North Pennsylvania, Roswell, N.Mex., and has been a resident of the State of New Mexico for a period of 5 or 6 years; that in the event he is elected to the said convention he will vote for the ratification of said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

PRAGER MILLER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of April 1933.

[SEAL] JOSE A. BACA, *Notary Public.*
My commission expires February 27, 1937.

In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our hands and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of New Mexico, this 16th day of October, A.D. 1933.

A. W. HOCKENHULL,
Governor of New Mexico.
JOHN C. WATSON,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.
MRS. MARGUERITE P. BACA,
Secretary of State of New Mexico.

[SEAL]

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of New York, transmitting original certificate of ratification of the amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, August 1, 1933.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you herewith the original certificate of ratification of the amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, duly executed and sworn to by the president and secretary of the convention held for the purpose in Albany on June 27, 1933, together with a true copy, certified by such officers, of the vote taken, showing the yeas and nays.

In accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York, certified copies of such papers are being transmitted by me on this date to the honorable the Secretary of State and to the honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Certificate of ratification by the State of New York of the amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the Congress of the United States to the several States, including the State of New York

We, the undersigned, Alfred E. Smith, the president, and Ruth B. Pratt, the secretary, of the State convention of delegates held in the assembly chamber at the capitol, in the city of Albany, in the State of New York, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, at the hour of 11 a.m., to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York, do hereby certify as follows:

1. The Congress of the United States duly proposed to the State of New York the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States reading as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

2. After the State of New York had been officially informed by the Congress of the United States that the proposed amendment aforesaid had been duly acted upon by the Congress of the United States and submitted to the State of New York for consideration and action thereupon, the Legislature of the State of New York duly passed an act which was approved by the Governor of the State of New York, and which became a law on April 6, 1933, with the approval of the Governor, and which act was passed by the senate and the assembly of the State of New York, three fifths of the members of each house being present at the time of the passage of the said act therein, the said act being chapter 143 of the Laws of New York of 1933.

3. That in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York delegates were duly nominated by petitions which were duly filed in the office of the secretary of state of New York and thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said act an election was duly held, after due notice thereof as required by law, in the various election districts throughout the State of New York on the 23d day of May 1933, between the hours of 12 o'clock noon and 10 p.m., at which such election 150 delegates were duly elected by paper ballots to consider and act upon the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution repealing the eighteenth article of amendment to said Constitution as submitted to the State of New York by the Congress of the United States.

4. That in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York the result of the votes cast at such election in the several election districts were duly canvassed and returned to the secretary of state of the State of New York within 10 days after said election, and immediately thereafter the said secretary of state prepared a list of the elected delegates, caused the same to be filed in the department of state, and mailed to each delegate a certificate of his election.

5. That in and by chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York the delegates hereinbefore referred to elected at the election held on May 23, 1933, were directed to meet in convention in the assembly chamber in the capitol in the city of Albany, State of New York, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, at the hour of 11 a.m. to consider and act upon the ratification of the amend-

ment providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States as proposed by the Congress of the United States to the State of New York.

6. That due notice of the time and place of such meeting was duly given to each of the 150 delegates elected as aforesaid by the secretary of state of the State of New York.

7. That the delegates to the convention aforesaid, in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933, met at the assembly chamber at the capitol in the city of Albany, in the State of New York, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, at the hour of 11 a.m., and that they constituted an official convention to pass upon the question of whether or not the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be ratified.

8. The meeting of the convention of said delegates, in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 was called to order by the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, Governor of the State of New York, and each delegate took and filed the constitutional oath of office before commencing to act as such delegate.

9. The call of the convention was read by the Honorable Edward J. Flynn, secretary of state of the State of New York. Upon such call it was disclosed that the following delegates were absent:

Nicholas Murray Butler, William M. Calder, Stephen Callaghan, Robert E. Christie, Jr., Livingston Farrand, Leonard Lipowicz, Joseph V. McKee, John G. Saxe, Herbert Bayard Swope.

10. In accordance with the provisions of said chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 the vacancies in the convention caused by the absence of the delegates aforesaid were filled by appointment by a majority of the delegates comprising the group from which said absent delegates were elected of the following:

Jane Quintard Clark, in place of Nicholas Murray Butler; Donald A. Dailey, in place of Robert E. Christie, Jr.; James A. Farley, in place of Herbert Bayard Swope; Edward J. Flynn, in place of Joseph V. McKee; T. Frank Gorman, in place of John G. Saxe; W. Kingsland Macy, in place of Livingston Farrand; William L. Marcy, Jr., in place of Leonard Lipowicz; Charles F. Murphy, in place of William M. Calder; Rosa M. Turk, in place of Stephen Callaghan.

11. The delegates so substituted thereupon duly took and subscribed to the constitutional oath required by said act, which oaths were duly filed as required by law.

12. Each of the 150 persons elected as delegates to the said convention and each of the 9 persons so appointed as substitute delegates thereto was at the time of his election and at the time of the holding of said convention a citizen and inhabitant of the State of New York.

13. The convention then proceeded to the election of its president, secretary, and other officers, and the following officers were duly unanimously elected as the officers of said convention:

President, Alfred E. Smith; honorary president, Ellhu Root; first vice president, James W. Wadsworth; second vice president, Harriet T. Mack; secretary, Ruth B. Pratt; assistant secretaries, Vincent Dailey, Raymond J. O'Sullivan, George W. Harder, George H. Payne; and parliamentarian, John T. Dooling.

14. By resolution duly presented, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the president of the convention was authorized to appoint stenographers, sergeant at arms, and other employees, and to fix the compensation of such stenographers and employees.

15. On taking the chair the president, Alfred E. Smith, addressed the convention.

16. Upon assuming the duties of their respective offices the honorary president, first and second vice presidents, and secretary also addressed the convention.

17. By resolutions duly presented, seconded, and unanimously carried the president was authorized to appoint the following committees:

Committee on rules, consisting of 16 members; committee on credentials, consisting of 16 members; committee on resolutions, consisting of 16 members.

18. The president appointed the following delegates members of the committees aforesaid:

19. Committee on credentials: Charles H. Tuttle (chairman), Warren B. Ashmead, William R. Bayes, Peter C. Brashear, Martin Cantine, Ruth Mason Cook, James G. Harbord, Frank L. Wiswall, David A. Avery, Benjamin S. Dean, Nisbet Grammer, Warnick K. Kernan, John L. Buckley, Louis A. Cuvillier, Nora Quinn, Thomas G. Ryan.

20. Committee on rules: Russell Wiggins (chairman), Melvin C. Eaton, Christiana M. Greene, Samuel S. Koenig, George J. Moore, Albert Ottinger, Bayard J. Stedman, William Ziegler, Jr., Mary C. Sinclair, Ellen Schaeffer, Edward P. Lynch, Charles J. Knapp, Ashley T. Cole, Dorothea Courten, Algernon Lee, Irwin Steingut.

21. Committee on resolutions: Pauline Morton Sabin (chairman), Donald A. Dailey, Fred J. Douglas, Julia D. Hanson, George Z. Medalle, Mary Stillman Harkness, John H. Kitchen, Fred J. H. Kracke, Henry Rogers Winthrop, Alfred E. Smith (ex officio), James P. B. Duffy, Irene O'D. Ferrer, Ann Murray Flynn, Kenneth Gardner, John J. Dunnigan, Dennis J. Mahon, Grayson M. P. Murphy.

22. Hon. Russell T. Wiggins, a delegate, presented a resolution providing that until the committee on rules submitted its report the rules of the Assembly of the State of New York for the year 1933 be adopted as the temporary rules of the convention, which resolution was unanimously adopted.

23. By resolution, duly presented, seconded, and unanimously adopted, a recess was taken to permit the committees on rules,

resolutions, and credentials to consider, prepare, and submit their reports.

24. Thereafter, when the committees advised the president that they were ready to submit their reports, the convention reconvened, and Hon. Russell T. Wiggins, chairman of the committee on rules, submitted the report of said committee, recommending that the rules of the Assembly of the State of New York for the year 1933 be adopted as the rules of the convention, which report was duly accepted; and thereafter, by motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the rules of the Assembly of the State of New York were duly adopted as the rules of the convention.

25. The Hon. Charles H. Tuttle, chairman of the committee on credentials, submitted his report—that there were no contests; that 150 delegates, whose names appeared on the temporary roll of the convention as certified by the secretary of state, had been duly and legally elected; that all of said delegates were present and had qualified except the nine hereinbefore named who were absent; that there had been duly and lawfully substituted in place of the absent delegates the following delegates:

Jane Quintard Clark, in place of Nicholas Murray Butler; Donald A. Dailey, in place of Robert E. Christie, Jr.; James A. Farley, in place of Herbert Bayard Swope; Edward J. Flynn, in place of Joseph V. McKee; T. Frank Gorman, in place of John G. Saxe; W. Kingsland Macy, in place of Livingston Farrand; William L. Marcy, Jr., in place of Leonard Lipowicz; Charles F. Murphy, in place of William M. Calder; Rosa M. Turk, in place of Stephen Callaghan.

That 150 delegates chosen in accordance with law were present; and that there was no contest affecting the seat of any delegate nor any question raised of his or her right to participate in the convention.

26. Mrs. Pauline Morton Sabin, chairman of the committee on resolutions, submitted the report of said committee and moved its adoption, a copy of which report is annexed hereto and marked "Exhibit A." After the report of the committee on resolutions had been read by Mrs. Pauline Morton Sabin, chairman of said committee, the following delegates addressed the convention on the subject matter of the resolutions and seconded her motion:

Hon. Thomas H. Cullen, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Hon. John J. O'Connor, of New York City.

Mrs. Alice Campbell Good, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Hon. Aaron L. Jacoby, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Hon. Louis Waldman, of New York City.

Mrs. Jeanie Rumsey Sheppard, of New York City, addressed the convention.

27. After all those who had desired to address the convention had completed their addresses, a resolution was duly presented, seconded, and unanimously carried that the report, as read by the chairman of the committee on resolutions, be adopted, and the report was unanimously adopted.

28. A resolution was then presented which was duly seconded and unanimously carried providing that the main question should then be put, and it was unanimously adopted.

29. The president declared that the motion had been carried and the question before the convention was on the adoption of the resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States as proposed by the Congress of the United States repealing the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, which said proposed amendment reads as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Thereupon the president directed that the roll of the delegates be called, and the roll of the delegates was called by the secretary, Mrs. Ruth B. Pratt, who entered the vote by yeas and nays on the journal of the convention.

30. On this question 150 delegates answered yea, and no delegate answered nay, and the president then announced that the resolution had been unanimously adopted and that the State of New York had, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the joint resolution of Congress, and in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933, acted upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and had ratified said proposed amendment providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

31. A resolution was thereafter presented, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, authorizing and directing the proper officers of the convention to prepare, execute, acknowledge, and file the certificates required by chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 in triplicate.

32. Thereafter upon motion duly made, seconded, and carried the convention adjourned sine die.

Dated, July 26, 1933.

ALFRED E. SMITH, President.
RUTH B. PRATT, Secretary.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

Alfred E. Smith and Ruth B. Pratt, being each separately duly sworn on oath each for himself and herself, does hereby certify and depose as follows:

That the said Alfred E. Smith is the duly elected chairman of the State convention held at the assembly chamber in the capitol, in the city of Albany, N.Y., on June 27, 1933, and the said Ruth B. Pratt is the duly elected secretary of the convention held in the assembly chamber in the capitol, in the city of Albany, N.Y., on June 27, 1933; that at said convention there were present and entitled to vote therein 150 delegates on the question of ratification of the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

That the 150 delegates who were entitled to 150 votes cast a unanimous vote in favor of ratification of said article and that no delegate present, entitled to vote, cast his or her vote against ratification of said article; that all votes cast were in favor of ratification and said article was by said convention duly ratified; that annexed hereto and made a part hereof is a full, true, and complete record of the proceedings had and taken and of things done by said convention held in the assembly chamber at the capitol, in the city of Albany, in the State of New York, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, which fully shows the result of votes taken, showing the yeas and nays, had at said convention on the questions submitted.

ALFRED E. SMITH.
RUTH B. PRATT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of July, 1933.
JOHN L. DOOLING,
Notary Public, New York County.

EXHIBIT A

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein) did resolve that the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by convention in three fourths of the several States; and

Whereas the said proposed amendment reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress"; and

Whereas there was duly transmitted to the legislature of this State the said article of amendment proposed by the Congress to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the legislature of this State, pursuant to law, did enact a statute entitled "An act to provide for a convention to consider and act upon the ratification of the amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment", which said act, having passed both houses of the legislature, was signed by the Governor of this State on April 6, 1933, and constitutes chapter 143 of the Laws of New York for the year 1933; and

Whereas, pursuant to the provisions of said act of the legislature, an election for the selection of delegates to the said convention was held in this State on May 23, 1933, at which said election 150 delegates were chosen in accordance with the provisions of said statute; and

Whereas the secretary of state has prepared a list of the delegates elected at said election and the same has been filed in the department of state, and the secretary of state has in accordance with the provisions of the said statute given notice of the time and place of the holding of the convention, which said notice reads as follows:

"DEAR SIR OR MADAM: You are hereby notified that the New York State convention to act on the amendment to the eighteenth article of the Constitution of the United States will convene in the assembly chamber at the capitol, Albany, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, at 11 a.m. eastern daylight saving time. It is expected the convention will be in session approximately 3 hours.

"If for any reason you find it impossible to attend, will you please notify me to that effect so that the vacancy caused by your absence may be filled?"

"There is enclosed herewith a blank oath of office which you are requested to execute and return to this department at the earliest possible moment.

"Very truly yours,

"EDWARD J. FLYNN,
"Secretary of State."

And,

Whereas, pursuant to the said notice and as provided in said act, the said convention has met at the time and place therein fixed and has organized by the election of a president, first and second vice presidents, secretary, and other officers, and has adopted rules governing its deliberations and is ready to proceed to consider the proposed article of amendment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this convention of the delegates representing the people of the State of New York duly assembled pursuant to law, That we do approve and ratify the proposed article of amendment proposed by the Congress to the Constitution of the United States designed to repeal the eighteenth article of the amendment, which said amendment reads as follows:

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein) did resolve that the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States; and

"Whereas the said proposed amendment reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

"And, further, the action of this convention in approving and ratifying the said proposed amendment is valid to all intents and purposes as representing the people of the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman and secretary of this convention shall certify the result of the votes of the delegates to the ratification of said amendment in triplicate, each signed by the president and secretary of the convention, to which there shall be attached a certificate, certified by such officers, of the record of the vote taken, showing the yeas and nays thereon, and that such certificates and certified copies of such record shall be deposited with the secretary of state of the State of New York, and he shall transmit one such certificate and certified copy of such record to the Secretary of State of the United States, another certificate and certified copy of such record to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, and another certificate and certified copy of such record to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, which said certificates shall be accompanied by the certificate of the secretary of state certifying that the persons signing the certificates so transmitted were the duly constituted president and secretary of said convention and that their signatures are genuine, and that before transmitting the certificates and copies of records so deposited with the secretary of state he shall make a copy of one of them, verifying it as such, and record it as a permanent record of the department of state; and be it further

Resolved, That the president, secretary, and any other officer of this convention and the delegates and secretary of state, or any or either of them, are hereby authorized to comply with any act or resolution of Congress requiring other or further confirmation of such ratification or rejection of said proposed amendment."

State convention of delegates held in the assembly chamber in the capitol, in the city of Albany, in the State of New York, on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, at the hour of 11 a.m., to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York.

REPORT OF TALLY CLERK OF THE RECORD OF THE VOTE TAKEN ON THE QUESTION OF RATIFICATION OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES PROPOSED BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE SEVERAL STATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 143 OF THE LAWS OF 1933

Those who voted in favor of ratifying the amendment: William S. Andrews, Benjamin Antin, Warren B. Ashmead, David A. Avery, Selden Bacon, William R. Bayes, Peter C. Brashear, Thomas A. Brogan, Charles E. Buchner, John L. Buckley, Nathan Burkan, Martha Byrne, Martin Cantine, Edward T. Carroll, Mary Chahoon, John E. Chapman, Joseph H. Choate, Jr., Jane Quintard Clark, Ashley T. Cole, Clarence F. Conroy, Ruth Mason Cook, Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Dorothea Courten, John R. Crews, William Nelson Cromwell, Thomas H. Cullen, Henry H. Curran, John F. Curry, Robert F. Cutler, Louis A. Cuvillier, Donald A. Bailey, May Davie, Archie O. Dawson, Benjamin S. Dean, William F. Delaney, Fred J. Douglas, James P. B. Duffy, John J. Dunnigan, James F. Dwyer, Keron F. Dwyer, Melvin C. Eaton, George Ellpern, Albert E. Fach,

James A. Farley, Irene O'D. Ferrer, Ann Murray Flynn, Edward J. Flynn, Francis E. Fronczak, Kenneth Gardner, Abraham S. Gilbert, Harrison C. Glore, Alice Campbell Good, May M. Gooderson, T. Frank Gorman, Nisbet Grammer, Christiana M. Greene, Julia D. Hanson, James G. Harbord, Mary Stillman Harkness, Louis B. Hart, Robert W. Higbie, Jr., Charles D. Hilles, Katherine S. Hinckley, Thomas L. Holling, Bettie F. Holmes, Ferdinand R. Horn, Jr., Winfield A. Huppuch, Cornelius Huth, Joseph S. Israel, Aaron L. Jacoby, Ralph Jonas, Samuel J. Joseph, Frank V. Kelly, Warnick K. Kernan, John Hill Kitchen, Charles J. Knapp, Samuel S. Koenig, Frederick J. H. Kracke, Ernest Lappano, John E. Larney, Algernon Lée, David F. Lee, Isabella R. Lovell, A. Augustus Low, Edward P. Lynch, John D. Lynn, James J. Lyons, John H. McCooey, Peter McGovern, William N. McIlravy, Terrence J. McManus, Harriet T. Mack, W. Kingsland Macy, Dennis J. Mahon, William L. Marcy, Jr., George Z. Medalie, Chase Mellen, Jr., George J. Moore, Thomas E. Morrissey, Edward P. Mulrooney, Charles F. Murphy, Grayson M. P. Murphy, Vincent B. Murphy, Ione Nicoll, Godfrey Nurse, John J. O'Connor, Marion O'Connor, Albert Ottinger, Nathan D. Perlman, Rosalie S. Phillips, Generoso Pope, Ruth Baker Pratt, Nora Quinn, Elihu Root, Thomas G. Ryan, Pauline Morton Sabin, Joseph J. Sartori, Helen Schaeffer, Edward Schoeneck, Elenore Sefton, James R. Sheffield, Jeanie Rumsey Sheppard, Mary C. Sinclair, Alfred E. Smith, Homer P. Snyder, James Speyer, Bayard J. Stedman, Irwin Steingut, Samuel Strasbourger, John Sullivan, Arthur Sutherland, John Boyd Thacher, John Theofil, Hamilton Travis, Harold L. Turk, Rosa M. Turk, Charles H. Tuttle, James W. Wadsworth, Louis Waldman, Robert E. Whalen, Charles S. Whitman, Gustav W. M. Wieboldt, Russell Wiggins, Elizabeth C. Wing, Henry Rogers Winthrop, Frank L. Wiswall, Elsie C. Woodward, James A. Zickler, William Ziegler, Jr., and Walter W. Zittel.

Yeas, 150; nays, 0.

We the undersigned, Alfred E. Smith, the president, and Ruth B. Pratt, the secretary, of the State convention of delegates held in the assembly chamber in the capitol in the city of Albany in the State of New York on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the record of the vote taken, showing the yeas and nays on the resolution by which said convention agreed to the ratification of said proposed amendment.

ALFRED E. SMITH, President.
RUTH B. PRATT, Secretary.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Albany.

I, Edward J. Flynn, secretary of state of the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York, do hereby certify that Alfred E. Smith was the duly constituted president and that Ruth B. Pratt was the duly constituted secretary of the State convention of delegates held in the assembly chamber in the city of Albany in the State of New York on Tuesday, June 27, 1933, to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that I am familiar with the handwriting of said Alfred E. Smith and said Ruth B. Pratt, and that their signatures upon the foregoing certificates are genuine.

In witness whereof I have in accordance with the provisions of chapter 143 of the Laws of 1933 of the State of New York, subscribed my name as secretary of state of the State of New York and affixed the great seal of the State of New York at the capitol in the city of Albany in the State of New York the 31st day of July 1933.

[SEAL] EDWARD J. FLYNN,
Secretary of State of the State of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate documents transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Utah, certifying to the ratification by a duly elected convention representing the State of Utah of the amendment to the Constitution repealing the eighteenth amendment thereto, which were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, Milton H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah, hereby certify that R. L. Olson was duly constituted president, and that Mrs. Paul Keyser was duly constituted secretary of the State convention of delegates held in the hall of the house of representatives at the State capitol in the city of Salt Lake, in the State of Utah, at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, December 5, 1933, to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the repeal of the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that I am familiar with the handwriting of said R. L. Olson and said Mrs. Paul Keyser, and that their signatures upon the attached certificates are genuine.

In witness whereof I have set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah, at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 5th day of December, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL] MILTON H. WELLING,
Secretary of State of the State of Utah.

Certificate attesting the ratification, by a duly elected convention representing the State of Utah, of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States

We, the undersigned, R. L. Olson, the president, and Mrs. Paul Keyser, the secretary of the State convention of delegates, held in the hall of the house of representatives at the capitol in Salt Lake City, State of Utah, on Tuesday, December 5, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon, to consider and act upon the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, do hereby certify as follows:

1. The Congress of the United States duly certified to the State of Utah a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, reading as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

2. After the State of Utah had been officially informed by the Congress of the United States that the proposed amendment aforesaid had been duly acted upon by the Congress of the United States and submitted to the State of Utah for consideration and action thereon, the Legislature of the State of Utah duly passed an act designated as chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, which was approved by the Governor of the State of Utah, and which became a law on March 21, 1933.

3. In accordance with the provisions of said chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, delegates were duly nominated by petitions legally filed in the office of the secretary of state of Utah and thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said act, an election was held, after due notice thereof as required by law, in the various election districts throughout the State of Utah on the 7th day of November 1933 at which such election 21 delegates were duly elected to consider and act upon the aforesaid proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

4. The board of State canvassers, meeting according to law in the office of the secretary of state at noon, November 27, 1933, did canvass the returns of the aforesaid election, and by their computation did find that the 21 delegates for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States received a greater number of votes than the 21 delegates against ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

5. That Milton H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah, did certify that the following 21 delegates, pledged to vote for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, are the duly elected delegates to a constitutional convention which by law is called to convene at 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, December 5, 1933, at the capitol in Salt Lake City, to ratify, as representing the people of the State of Utah, the proposed article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Glen O. Allred, Price; George S. Ballif, Provo; Clarence Bamberger, Salt Lake City; John O. Beesley, Provo; Ephraim Bergeson, Cornish; Sophus Bertelson, Ephraim; A. S. Brown, Salt Lake City; Lawrence Clayton, Ogden; T. Earl Clements, Park City; Miah Day, Fillmore; A. C. Ellis, Jr., Salt Lake City; Mat Gilmour, Price; L. B. Hampton, Salt Lake City; Franklin Hansen, Moroni; Mrs. John A. Hendricks, Ogden; L. A. Hollenbeck, Duchesne; Mrs. L. B. McCornick, Salt Lake City; R. L. Olson, Ogden; Mrs. S. Grover Rich, Salt Lake City; Franklin Riter, Salt Lake City; Sam D. Thurman, Salt Lake City.

6. The delegates to the convention aforesaid, in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, met in the hall of the house of representatives at the capitol in Salt Lake City in the State of Utah on Tuesday, December 5, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon, and that they constituted an official convention pledged to vote for the above-proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

7. The delegates to the aforesaid constitutional convention, held in accordance with the resolution of the Congress of the United States and the provisions of said chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, invited His Excellency Henry H. Blood, Governor of Utah, to call the convention to order and to preside over its temporary organization. Accordingly, the convention was called to order by the Honorable Henry H. Blood at 12 o'clock noon, December 5, 1933.

8. The certificate of election of delegates to the convention was read by the Honorable Milton H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah. The roll was then called, and it was disclosed that one delegate was absent, namely, Mrs. S. Grover Rich.

9. In accordance with the provisions of chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, the vacancy in the convention caused by the absence of the delegate aforesaid was filled by the election, by unanimous vote, of Mrs. Paul Keyser.

10. The 21 delegates to the convention thereupon subscribed to the constitutional oath of office prescribed by the State of Utah

before entering upon their official duties, said oath being administered by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Utah D. N. Straup.

11. The convention then proceeded to the election of its president, vice president, and secretary, as follows:

President, R. L. Olson; vice president, Clarence Bamberger; and secretary, Mrs. Paul Keyser.

The oath of office being administered by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Utah D. N. Straup to the officers of the convention.

12. President R. L. Olson delivered his formal address to the delegates of the convention. After concluding his address he introduced His Excellency, Henry H. Blood, Governor of Utah, who also addressed the convention.

13. By resolution duly adopted, the president was authorized to appoint the following committees:

Committee on credentials, consisting of 10 members, as follows: Sam D. Thurman (chairman), John O. Beesley, T. Earl Clements, Franklin Hansen, Mrs. L. B. McCornick, Glen O. Allred, Sophus Bertelson, Miah Day, Mrs. John A. Hendricks, Ephraim Bergeson.

Committee on resolutions, consisting of 10 members, as follows: Franklin Riter, chairman, Clarence Bamberger, Lawrence Clayton, Mat Gilmour, L. A. Hollenbeck, George S. Ballif, A. S. Brown, A. C. Ellis, Jr., L. B. Hampton, Mrs. Paul Keyser.

14. By special invitation of the delegates the convention was addressed by the Hon. Anthony W. Ivins, a member of the State constitutional convention held May 8, 1895. Twelve members of said constitutional convention were present as special guests of the convention.

15. The convention recessed to permit the committees on credentials and resolutions to consider, prepare, and submit their reports. Thereafter the convention reconvened.

16. Sam D. Thurman, chairman of the committee on credentials, reported as follows:

"To the president and members of that certain convention held at Salt Lake City, Utah, December 5, 1933, to consider the ratification of the proposed twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America:

"Your committee has met, examined the roll of delegates as prepared by the secretary of state, and his certificate of election, and has found the same to be correct, and that the delegates named in said certificate of election had been duly elected, and that there were no contests; and reports that the delegates as certified to the convention by the secretary of state, together with Mrs. Paul Keyser, of Salt Lake City, who has been elected a delegate to this convention to fill the vacancy created by the absence of Mrs. S. Grover Rich, are the accredited delegates of this convention.

"They are as follows:

"Glen O. Allred, Price; George S. Ballif, Provo; Clarence Bamberger, Salt Lake City; John O. Beesley, Provo; Ephraim Bergeson, Cornish; Sophus Bertelson, Ephraim; A. S. Brown, Salt Lake City; Lawrence Clayton, Ogden; T. Earl Clements, Park City; Miah Day, Fillmore; A. C. Ellis, Jr., Salt Lake City; Mat Gilmour, Price; L. B. Hampton, Salt Lake City; Franklin Hansen, Moroni; Mrs. John A. Hendricks, Ogden; L. A. Hollenbeck, Duchesne; Mrs. Paul Keyser, Salt Lake City; Mrs. L. B. McCornick, Salt Lake City; R. L. Olson, Ogden; Franklin Riter, Salt Lake City; and Sam D. Thurman, Salt Lake City."

The report of the committee was unanimously adopted.

17. Franklin Riter, chairman of the committee on resolutions, submitted the report of said committee and moved its adoption, a copy of which report is annexed hereto and marked "Exhibit A." The committee report was unanimously adopted.

18. The President declared that the main question was now before the convention, namely, a "yea-and-nay" vote on the adoption of the resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States as proposed by the Congress of the United States, repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which proposed amendment reads as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Thereupon the president directed that the roll of the delegates be called, and the roll of the delegates was called by the secretary, Mrs. Paul Keyser, who entered the vote by "yeas" and "nays" on the journal of the convention.

19. On this question 21 delegates answered "yea" and no delegate answered "nay", and the president then announced that the resolution had been unanimously adopted and that the State of Utah, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the joint resolution of Congress of the United States, and in accordance with the provisions of chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933, had ratified the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Such ratification, as representing the

people of the State of Utah, occurred at 3:32½ o'clock p.m., Tuesday, December 5, 1933.

20. Upon motion duly made, seconded, and carried, the convention adjourned sine die.

R. L. OLSON, *President.*

Mrs. PAUL KEYSER, *Secretary.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of December, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

FRANK E. LEES, *Notary Public.*

EXHIBIT A

Report of committee on resolutions to the president and members of that certain convention held at Salt Lake City, Utah, December 5, 1933, to consider the ratification of the proposed twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America

The committee on resolutions has met and has carefully considered the question of acting upon the ratification of the proposed twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, and we recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolution

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein) did resolve that the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States; and

"Whereas the said proposed amendment reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State, pursuant to its constitutional authority, did enact a statute entitled 'An act to provide for conventions to pass on amendments to the Constitution of the United States which have or may hereafter be proposed by Congress for ratification by conventions of the several States', which said statute, having passed both houses of the legislature of this State, was signed by the Governor of this State on March 21, 1933, and constitutes chapter 22, Laws of the State of Utah, twentieth regular session of the legislature, 1933; and

"Whereas on August 10, 1933, Gov. Henry H. Blood proclaimed that an election for the election of 21 delegates to attend a constitutional convention to be held at Salt Lake City, December 5, 1933, to ratify or reject the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be held November 7, 1933; and

"Whereas nominating petitions containing the required number of names were filed with the secretary of state for 21 delegates to the aforesaid constitutional convention for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas nominating petitions containing the required number of names were filed with the secretary of state for 21 delegates to the aforesaid constitutional convention against ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas, pursuant to the provisions of said statute of the legislature, an election for the election of delegates to said convention was held in this State on November 7, 1933, at which said election 21 delegates were chosen in accordance with the provisions of said statute; and

"Whereas the board of State canvassers, meeting according to law in the office of the secretary of state at noon, November 27, 1933, did canvass the returns of the aforesaid election, and by their computation did find that the 21 delegates for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States received a greater number of votes than the 21 delegates against ratification of the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas Milton H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah, did, under his hand and the great seal of the State of Utah, at Salt Lake City, Utah, on the 28th day of November 1933, certify that the following 21 delegates, pledged to vote for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, are the duly elected delegates to the Constitutional Convention which, by law, is called to convene at 12 o'clock noon December 5, 1933, at the capitol in Salt Lake City:

"Glen O. Allred, Price; George S. Ballif, Provo; Clarence Bamberger, Salt Lake City; John O. Beesley, Provo; Ephraim Bergeson, Cornish; Sophus Bertelson, Ephraim; A. S. Brown, Salt Lake City; Lawrence Clayton, Ogden; T. Earl Clements, Park City; Miah Day, Fillmore; A. C. Ellis, Jr., Salt Lake City; Matt Gilmour, Price; L. B. Hampton, Salt Lake City; Franklin Hansen, Moroni; Mrs.

John A. Hendricks, Ogden; L. A. Hollenbeck, Duchesne; Mrs. L. B. McCormick, Salt Lake City; R. L. Olson, Ogden; Mrs. S. Grover Rich, Salt Lake City; Franklin Riter, Salt Lake City; Sam D. Thurman, Salt Lake City.

"And

"Whereas said certificate of election has been filed in the Department of State of the State of Utah; and

"Whereas, pursuant to section 8 of said statute, designated as chapter 22, Laws of the State of Utah, passed at the twentieth session of the legislature, 1933, the said convention has met at the time and place fixed by said statute, to wit, at 12 o'clock noon, December 5, 1933, and has organized by the election of a president, vice president, secretary, and other officers, and has adopted rules governing its deliberations and is ready to proceed to consider the proposed article of amendment; and

"Whereas Mrs. S. Grover Rich, of Salt Lake City, the regularly elected and qualified delegate to this convention, was and is absent from the State of Utah and is not present at the sessions of said convention, and pursuant to the authority vested in said convention by section 7, chapter 22, Laws of Utah, 1933 (regular session), Mrs. Paul Keyser, of Salt Lake City, has been elected and designated a delegate to said convention to fill the vacancy created by the absence of Mrs. S. Grover Rich: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this convention of the delegates representing the people of the State of Utah, duly assembled pursuant to law, that we do approve and ratify the proposed article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America proposed by the Congress thereof and designed to repeal the eighteenth article of amendment to said Constitution, which proposed article of amendment reads as follows:

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), each resolved that the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three fourths of the several States;

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

"Be it further

"Resolved, That the action of this convention in approving and ratifying the said proposed amendment is valid to all intents and purposes as representing the people of the State of Utah, and be it further

"Resolved, That the president and secretary of this convention shall certify the result of the votes of the delegates to the ratification of said amendment in triplicate, each signed by the president and secretary of the convention to which there shall be attached a certificate certified by such officers of the record of the vote taken, showing the yeas and nays thereon, and that such certificates and certified copies of such record shall be deposited with the secretary of state of the State of Utah, and he shall transmit one such certificate and certified copy of such record to the Secretary of State of the United States, another certificate and certified copy of such record to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, and another certificate and certified copy of such record to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, which said certificates shall be accompanied by the certificate of the secretary of state certifying that the persons signing the certificates so transmitted were the duly constituted president and secretary of said convention, and that their signatures are genuine, and that before transmitting the certificates and copies of records so deposited with the secretary of state he shall make a copy of one of them, certifying it as such and record it as a permanent record of the secretary of state of the State of Utah; and be it further

"Resolved, That the president, secretary, and any other officer of this convention and the delegates and secretary of state or any or either of them are hereby authorized to comply with any act or resolution of the Congress of the United States requiring other or further confirmation of such ratification or rejection of said proposed amendment; and

"Resolved further, That in the event of the death, disability, or absence of the president of this convention from the State of Utah, the vice president of this convention be, and he is hereby authorized to execute all instruments and documents intended or required to be executed by said president; and

"Resolved further, That in the event of the death, disability, or absence from the State of Utah of the secretary of this convention, that the signature of the chairman of the committee on resolutions of this convention to said certificates and documents shall to all intents and purposes be of the same legal effect as the signature of said secretary."

FRANKLIN RITER, *Chairman.*

GEORGE S. BALLIF.

A. S. BROWN.

LAWRENCE CLAYTON.

A. C. ELLIS, JR.

CLARENCE BAMBERGER.

L. B. HAMPTON.

L. A. HOLLENBECK.

Mrs. PAUL KEYSER.

State convention of delegates held in the hall of the house of representatives at the capitol in the city of Salt Lake in the State of Utah, on Tuesday, December 5, 1933, at the hour of 12 m., to consider and act upon the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 22 of the Laws of the State of Utah passed at the twentieth regular session of the legislature, 1933.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE CONVENTION

On the record of the vote taken on the question of ratification of the twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States to the several States, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 22 of the Laws of the State of Utah, passed at the twentieth regular session of the legislature, 1933.

Those who voted in favor of ratifying the amendment: Glen O. Allred, George S. Ballif, Clarence Bamberger, John O. Beesley, Ephraim Bergeson, Sophus Bertelson, A. S. Brown, Lawrence Clayton, T. Earl Clements, Miah Day, A. C. Ellis, Jr., Mat Gilmour (absent), L. B. Hampton, Franklin Hansen, Mrs. John A. Hendricks, L. A. Hollenbeck, Mrs. Paul Keyser, Mrs. L. B. McCornick, R. L. Olson, Franklin Riter, and Sam D. Thurman.

Yeas, 20; nays, 0; absent, 1.

We hereby certify and declare that the above and foregoing is a true and correct tally list of the vote of delegates at the above described convention held at Salt Lake City, Utah, on December 5, 1933, on the resolution ratifying the twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Dated at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 5th day of December, A.D. 1933.

R. L. OLSON,
President of the Convention.
Mrs. PAUL KEYSER,
Secretary of the Convention.

DISPOSITION OF TAXES IN PUERTO RICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 3 of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, a certified copy of that resolution "to request of the Congress of the United States that the taxes levied by section 211 of the act entitled 'to encourage national industrial recovery, to foster fair competition, and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works, and for other purposes', approved June 16, 1933, be reimbursed to the people of Puerto Rico to be used to further industry and agriculture, and for the general aggrandizement of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes", which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION OF VETERANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of Arizona, transmitting a joint memorial of the legislature of that State, which, with the accompanying joint memorial, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 14, 1933.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith House Joint Memorial I, as adopted by the first special session of the Eleventh Arizona Legislature.

The memorial respectfully requests that the President and Congress, either by legislation or regulations, reinstate the time heretofore in force for allowing presumptive disability; to allow the same rules for reduction of compensation for direct service-connected disability to apply to presumptive disabilities; and to reinstate all life statutory awards for arrested tuberculosis as the same heretofore existed.

Respectfully yours,

B. B. MOEUR, Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, correct, and complete copy of House Joint Memorial No. 1, first special session, eleventh legislature, State of Arizona, entitled "A memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, relating to disability compensation of veterans," all of which is shown by the original engrossed copy on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona, done at Phoenix, the capital, this 14th day of June, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

A memorial to the President and Congress of the United States relating to disability compensation of veterans

Your memorialist, the Eleventh Legislature of the State of Arizona, in special session convened, respectfully represents:

Whereas the President of the United States has been given power to make regulations reducing compensation heretofore paid war veterans; and

Whereas the President, pursuant to such power, has made regulations materially reducing the time for allowing presumptive disability from 5½ years to 1 year, thereby completely eliminating a large majority of meritorious presumptive cases from any compensation whatsoever; and

Whereas a regulation has been promulgated depriving certain veterans heretofore allowed life statutory award for arrested tuberculosis of their compensation as such; and

Whereas such regulations are palpably unjust and will entail extreme hardship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and Congress of the United States be, and hereby are, requested to, either by legislation or regulations, reinstate the time heretofore in force for allowing presumptive disability, to allow the same rules for reduction of compensation for direct service-connected disability to apply to presumptive disabilities, and to reinstate all life statutory awards for arrested tuberculosis as the same heretofore existed.

Passed the senate June 10, 1933.

Passed the house June 9, 1933.

Approved June 10, 1933.

Received by the secretary of state June 10, 1933.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following house memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Arizona, ss:

I, James H. Kerby, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within is a true, correct, and complete copy of House Memorial No. 2, first special session, eleventh legislature, State of Arizona, entitled "On the early settlers who were deprived of their homes by the confirmation of Spanish land grants", all of which is shown by the original engrossed copy on file in this department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 22d day of June, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

JAMES H. KERBY,
Secretary of State.

House Memorial No. 2, on the early settlers who were deprived of their homes by the confirmation of Spanish land grants

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents:

Between the years 1878 and 1892 many pioneer families in good faith settled in the southern part of Arizona upon lands which they believed to be part of the public domain and formed the nuclei of self-reliant, self-supporting, patriotic settlements and communities of bona fide citizens.

These hardy pioneers built homes, cultivated the soil, endured hardships and privations, withstood the onslaughts of the savage Apaches, and reared their families in the face of great difficulties.

Confident that the land upon which their homes were built would be allotted to them by the Government, they persisted in their brave struggle, determined to overcome every adverse force of nature and to make of their homes the permanent abiding places of a contented, useful citizenry.

But when title to these lands was given by the courts to the holders of Spanish land-grant claims, these pioneer settlers were dispossessed, their homes, improvements, fields, all the fruits of their labors of years taken from them, and they were left impoverished.

Many of these old pioneers are now gone, but some of them survive, still suffering from the loss sustained when they were deprived of their homes. Though poor, they are good citizens, attached to the State, earnestly striving to do their part toward its upbuilding.

Wherefore, in view of these facts, your memorialist prays the United States Congress to recognize that these old settlers are entitled to recompense for the damages suffered when their homes were taken from them, and that a court be established or a commission created for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of such damages, and that upon such determination provisions be made for reimbursement.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Adopted by house June 20, 1933.

Received by the secretary of state June 22, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 7 (by Mr. Lester) memorializing Congress to pass an old person's pension law

Whereas a great many old persons are now dependent on the charities of relatives, friends, and the public, either county or State; and

Whereas the States and Nation have pensioned many classes of persons no more deserving than the old and dependent citizens of our country who have given the best of their lives for the benefit of the younger generations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of delegates, (the senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of West Virginia respectfully requests and petitions the Congress of the United States to formulate and pass, as soon as possible, such a just and equitable old persons' pension law as will afford such persons reasonable comfort during the short remainder of their life; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the senate and house of delegates have copies of this memorial sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the United States Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

We, Charles Lively, clerk of the Senate of West Virginia, and John S. Hall, clerk of the House of Delegates of West Virginia, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was regularly adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia on December 19, 1933.

CHARLES LIVELY,
Clerk of the Senate.

JNO. S. HALL,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Frazier bill and place American agriculture on a basis of equality with other industries

Whereas Kansas is largely an agricultural State and largely dependent on that industry; and

Whereas prices of agricultural products, both crops and livestock, are now, and have long been, so low that the farmers are unable to pay taxes, interest, and upkeep, and to secure a living return for their capital and labor; and

Whereas interest rates on farm-mortgage indebtedness from both private and public funds have not decreased in proportion to the decreases in prices of agricultural products; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill known as the "Frazier bill" which provides that the Federal Government, with Treasury notes, shall refinance farm mortgages at an interest rate of 1½ percent and an amortization rate of 1½ percent, making a total of 3 percent, the Treasury notes being retired as the mortgage debt is paid; and

Whereas such legislation is necessary in order to rehabilitate American agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact into law, as soon as possible, the Frazier bill. Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Members of the Kansas delegation in both House and Senate.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate and passed that body November 8, 1933.

CHAS. W. THOMPSON,
President of the Senate.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house November 8, 1933.

W. H. VORMAN,
Speaker of the House.
W. T. BISHOP,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution relating to Federal action to prevent excessive salaries and profits in the manufacture and distribution of dairy products

Whereas the present milk strike is in large part due to agitation over alleged excessive profits earned and unreasonably high salaries paid by large dairy companies; and

Whereas there is reason to believe that there is some basis for these complaints and that some of the dairy companies have earned excessive profits even during the period of acute depression

and that salaries have been paid to high officials which are in excess of any reasonable figure; and

Whereas only the Federal Government can deal with the problem presented by these large profits and excessive salaries in the manufacture and distribution of dairy products: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States in administering the National Farm Relief Act to take into consideration the profits made and the salaries paid by the large dairy companies and in all measures which he may take under this act to bring farm prices up to higher levels he allow only a reasonable return and permit only reasonable salaries in the manufacture and distribution of dairy products; be it further

Resolved, That this legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such other action as may be necessary to prevent unreasonable profits and salaries in the dairy industry and to secure for the farmers the higher prices for dairy products, which will be rendered possible if excessive profits and unreasonable salaries to manufacturers and distributors are eliminated; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin member thereof.

THOMAS J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution relating to standards for imported dairy products

Whereas the appalling distressful economic condition of dairy farmers, especially the dairymen of Wisconsin, is now a matter of national concern; and

Whereas more than 70 percent of the cheese produced in the United States is produced in the State of Wisconsin; and

Whereas such cheese and other milk products are produced in conformity with the highest standards of sanitation known anywhere in the world and are produced from milk derived from tuberculin-tested cows, the State of Wisconsin being accredited free from bovine tuberculosis by the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas large sums have been expended by the Federal and State Governments and the dairymen of this State in the eradication of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases in cattle and the adoption and enforcement of barn scores and other sanitary standards of production; and

Whereas approximately 15 percent of the cheese consumed in the United States, representing nearly 1,000,000,000 pounds of surplus milk, is annually imported from foreign countries where no tuberculin tests of cattle or other sanitary standards are imposed or enforced, and such cheese is made from milk from cattle in herds that are 48 percent tubercular and is processed in human dwellings in contact with virulent cases of infantile paralysis and other contagious diseases; and

Whereas a bill to place all imports of cheese, butter, and all milk food products under the same sanitary regulations as are imposed upon the same milk products produced in Wisconsin has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Dr. CHARLES W. HENNEY, representing the second district of Wisconsin, as bill H.R. 3829, and a twin bill, S. 1628, has since been introduced in the Senate by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the Legislature of Wisconsin hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to immediately pass bill H.R. 3829, and further respectfully memorializes that President Roosevelt and the Secretary of Agriculture to include the enactment of this legislation in their farm program as a material and positive step in alleviating the present depressed condition of the dairy industry; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Roosevelt, to the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, to Hon. MARVIN JONES, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

O. S. LOOMIS,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution against the removal of Lock and Dam No. 10, upper Mississippi River improvement project, from Cassville, Wis.

Whereas Cassville was selected as the logical site for Lock and Dam No. 10, by Government engineers after 3 years' careful and impartial survey; and

Whereas Guttenberg, Iowa, citizens filed a protest to such location and the Rock Island office issued an announcement on October 5, 1933, that said site has been changed to Guttenberg, Iowa; and

Whereas port rights for Glen Haven, Wis., were surrendered and the State's rights forfeited when the channel was permitted to be moved to the Iowa side some 40 years ago; and

Whereas it has been a constant and heavy expense to the Government each year since to keep such channel open to navigation by the use of dredges, proving conclusively that the natural channel was rightfully on the Wisconsin side; and

Whereas if said dam is permitted to remain at Cassville this expense would be eliminated, and, in all likelihood, port rights restored to Glen Haven, with better navigation through higher water level insured to Guttenberg because of the necessity of conserving flood waters here to maintain a 9-foot channel; and

Whereas the serious relief problem which now confronts Cassville and Grant County would practically be solved by furnishing work for several years to hundreds now unemployed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring). That this legislature registers its most emphatic protest against the removal of Lock and Dam No. 10 from Cassville—the site originally selected by experienced Government engineers after a careful survey; and be it further

Resolved. That suitable copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Albert G. Schmedeman, Harold L. Ickes, Public Works Administrator, Washington, D.C., to both houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
THOMAS J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution relating to pensions for Spanish-American War veterans and the disabled veterans of the World War

Whereas the National Economy Act (Public Law No. 2, 73d Cong., 1st sess.) cut off from all allowances by the Federal Government all disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer rebellion, the Philippine insurrection, and the World War who cannot establish that their disabilities resulted from war service; and

Whereas this is particularly unjust in the case of the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer rebellion, and the Philippine insurrection because no adequate hospital records were kept during these wars, so that it is practically impossible for veterans of these wars, although disabled in service, to establish this fact; and

Whereas under this act many hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans will on July 1 be cut off from the Federal pension rolls and thereafter receive no allowances whatsoever from the Federal Government; and

Whereas many of these veterans are incapacitated to such an extent that they cannot possibly get along without help from some source; and

Whereas this act of the Federal Government will increase immensely the relief burden of the county and local governments: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring). That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to reconsider its action on the elimination from the Federal pension rolls of disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer rebellion, the Philippine insurrection, and the World War, and that it amend this legislation so that disabled veterans will receive allowances adequate to their support; be it further

Resolved. That properly attested copies of this resolution shall upon adoption be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

THOMAS J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. W. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of

LXXVIII—4

Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant Federal aid to abolish the inhuman treatment and the lynching of Negro prisoners

Whereas the people of the State of Wisconsin have been deeply shocked by, and justifiably incensed over, the inhuman and barbarous treatment accorded Negro prisoners in southern prison camps and the shocking lynching of Negroes which have at various times been perpetrated in some of the southern States; and

Whereas it is the sense of the people and the legislature of this State that such inhuman treatment has a marked and definite tendency to destroy respect of our people for law and order; and

Whereas the treatment accorded the Negro prisoners in some southern prison camps, commonly referred to as "chain gangs", is horrifying, and the pain and suffering to which these Negro prisoners are subjected is excruciating; and

Whereas the dispensation of justice to and punishment of Negroes suspected of crime is not a matter to be dealt with by a group of aroused and angry citizens having no real consideration for constitutional rights and no respect for the adopted and deliberative rules of evidence and procedure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring). That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin earnestly requests and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will effectively end the lynching or other destruction of Negroes accused or suspected of crime in any other way or by any other authority than the due process of law, and by a duly constituted code of justice, and to put a stop to the un-Christianlike treatment of Negro prisoners by law-enforcing officers in some prison camps; and be it further

Resolved. That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

THOMAS J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which were ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to promptly ratify the pending Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty

Whereas the State of Wisconsin is, and has been since its organization, a member of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, an association of States for the promotion of a treaty with Canada which would provide for the construction of an ocean-way from ports on the Great Lakes to the sea, and successive legislatures of Wisconsin have at each session made appropriations for carrying on the promotional work of said association for said purpose, and

Whereas on the 18th day of July 1932, there was executed by the Governments of the United States and Canada a seaway treaty, fair and equitable to both Nations, providing for the construction of such ocean-way and equal division of the costs, which treaty is now on the Executive Calendar of the United States Senate for ratification by that body when it convenes January next: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring). That we respectfully memorialize and urge the United States Senate to promptly ratify in its present form the pending Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty as a real, natural, basic, and permanent form of agricultural and industrial relief for the Mid West; and be it further

Resolved. That engrossed and properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the State of Wisconsin with the urgent request that they exert their utmost effort in securing such ratification in the early days of the approaching session.

CORNELIUS YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
THOMAS J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution expressing confidence in the program which President Roosevelt has presented for ending the depression

Whereas President Roosevelt in the short time that he has been President has presented to Congress a most comprehensive pro-

gram for ending the depression, which includes among other measures the following: Agricultural relief through the adoption of a definite plan of increasing the prices of the principal farm products and through making available above \$2,000,000,000 for refinancing the farmers; unemployment relief through providing millions of jobs for the unemployed under a gigantic \$3,300,000,000 public-works program; through encouraging private industries to reduce hours of labor and more equitably distribute available employment; a \$500,000,000 reforestation flood-control program designed particularly to give employment to young men, and the outright grant of \$500,000,000 to the States for direct relief; the reduction of normal Federal expenditures by nearly \$1,000,000,000; the legalization of beer, and the recommendation to the States that they promptly ratify the pending amendment repealing the eighteenth amendment; the initiation of measures to promote international understanding, to remove burdensome restrictions on international trade, and to secure an agreement on the part of all nations on the necessary economic measures to overcome the depression; the refinancing of home-mortgage indebtedness through a \$2,000,000,000 bond issue; strict regulation of securities sales and issues; the development of the long-delayed Muscle Shoals project; the strengthening of the banking system; the request to American employers to increase wages; and lastly, but not least important, the abandonment of the gold standard, and effective measures to raise the general price level and to lighten the burden of debts; and

Whereas while only a part of this program has thus far been enacted into law, the beneficial effects of the policies advocated and put into operation by the President are already apparent in increased confidence and rapidly rising prices for basic materials; therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring). That the legislature of Wisconsin hereby expresses its appreciation of the courageous and able leadership of President Roosevelt and its confidence in the program which he has advocated and already in part put into effect to end the depression; be it further

Resolved. That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Roosevelt and to both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

O. S. LOOMIS,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. T. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, Sam W. Mitchell, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting the purchase of Montana cattle for distribution to workers on Federal projects and for the relief of the destitute in the State of Montana, enacted by the extraordinary Twenty-third Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by F. H. Cooney, Governor of said State, on the 18th day of December 1933.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 19th day of December, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL, Secretary of State.

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting the purchase of Montana cattle for distribution to workers on Federal projects and for the relief of the destitute in the State of Montana

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the extraordinary session of the State of Montana Twenty-third Legislative Assembly, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Federal Government supplies rations to workers on Federal projects and also for the relief of the needy; and

Whereas Montana is a producing State and has a surplus of approximately 300,000 cattle of good type and exceptional quality; and

Whereas adverse weather conditions would result in the death of many of these animals from starvation if the Federal Relief Commission did not provide hay and grain for their subsistence; and

Whereas the chief, United States Bureau of Animal Industry, has signified his willingness and intention to provide temporary emergency meat inspection at slaughter houses and abattoirs within the State of Montana, which are approved by representatives of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry and Montana Livestock Sanitary Board, so that the carcasses of animals slaughtered at such establishments may be inspected and passed upon by Federal meat inspectors and purchased by Federal agencies for distribution to workers on Federal projects and for relief; and

Whereas fresh meat is a more palatable and nutritious product than canned meat; and

Whereas climatic conditions in the State of Montana make the distribution of fresh beef more economical than the distribution of canned beef: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring). That this legislative assembly petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to provide that beef distributed within the State of Montana for workers on Federal projects and for the relief of the destitute be fresh meat from animals raised and slaughtered in the State of Montana.

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of the State of Montana be, and is hereby, directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this memorial to each, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Montana delegation in Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

D. A. DELLWO,
Speaker of the House.
R. PAULINE,

President of the Senate Pro Tempore.

Approved December 18, 1933.

F. H. COONEY, Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Montana, ss:

I, Sam W. Mitchell, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of effective laws prohibiting the producers and distributors of gasoline from establishing unfair and unjust prices for the sale at retail to the people of the United States, and thus removing unjust discrimination, enacted by the extraordinary Twenty-third Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by F. H. Cooney, Governor of said State, on the 18th day of December, 1933.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 19th day of December, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL]

SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

A memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of effective laws prohibiting the producers and distributors of gasoline from establishing unfair and unjust prices for the sale at retail to the people of the United States, and thus removing unjust discrimination

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the members of the Twenty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana in special session assembled, the house and senate concurring, respectfully request that ways and means may be by you devised at an early date for the determination and fixing of a fair and just value of the price of gasoline at retail throughout the States of the Union; and to that end and for that purpose that a law be enacted prohibiting the producers and distributors of gasoline from fixing unjust, unfair, and discriminatory prices for the sale of gasoline in the several States, thus prohibiting and preventing producers and distributors of gasoline from establishing unfair, unjust, and discriminatory differentials in prices for the sale of gasoline at different points in the several States, thereby relieving the consumer from the payment of exorbitant and discriminatory prices for gasoline. Further in this connection we respectfully suggest the propriety of enacting a law conferring upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power and authority to establish and fix rates at which gasoline may be sold by the producers and distributors thereof, and providing heavy penalties for unjust and unfair discrimination or other violation of the law or the regulations promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission prescribing rates at which gasoline shall be sold to the consumers in the United States; be it further

Resolved. That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Montana.

D. A. DELLWO,
Speaker of the House.
R. PAULINE,

President of the Senate pro tempore.

Approved December 18, 1933.

F. H. COONEY, Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of original Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, as passed by the special session of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, and approved December 20, 1933, at 12:17 p.m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 22d day of December, A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

A. M. CLARK, Secretary of State.
By C. J. ROGERS, Deputy.

Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1, Senate, Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal land-bank district composed of intermountain States

Whereas there exists a condition placing citizens of intermountain States at a disadvantage when applying for farm credit as provided by recent act of Congress; and

Whereas this condition is largely due to the lack of understanding of local conditions in such States by the Farm Credit Administration; therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming in special session assembled (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to immediately establish a Federal land-bank district composed of intermountain States, with a Federal land bank conveniently located within the district, the administration and management of same to be conducted by a personnel with experience and an intimate knowledge of the local situations and conditions; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members of the congressional delegation of this State in Congress.

WM. M. JACK,
Speaker of the House.
OSCAR BECK,
President of the Senate.

Approved December 20, 1933.

LESLIE A. MILLER,
Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation preventing the importation of meat products under American names

Whereas certain foreign countries are shipping certain meat products into the United States, labeling said products with American names; and

Whereas such labeling is deceptive and is unfair competition with American meat products and especially injurious to the American farmer: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent the aforesaid practices; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Minnesota be instructed to send copies of this resolution to both Houses of Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

CHAS. MUNN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
K. K. HOLBERG,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 15th day of December 1933.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.
Passed the senate the 21st day of December 1933.

Secretary of the Senate.

Approved December 23, 1933.

FLOYD B. OLSEN,
Governor of State of Minnesota.

Filed December 26, 1933.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State of Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Joint resolution memorializing the United States Senate to ratify at the approaching session of Congress the treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada for the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas the project of connecting the Great Lakes with tide-water by a deep-waterway channel is of vital interest to all of the people of the State of Minnesota and others residing in the central and western part of the country; and

Whereas there has recently been concluded a treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada for the building of such channel; and

Whereas hearings have been held by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate on such treaty, and said Foreign Relations Committee has reported out said treaty for such seaway with the recommendation that said treaty be ratified, and said treaty is now pending before said Senate for ratification at the approaching session of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (and the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota concurring), That the State of Minnesota memorialize the Senate of the United States shortly to be in session, and by the adoption of this joint resolution the State of Minnesota does memorialize the Senate of the United States, to ratify at the approaching session of the Congress of the United States the treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada providing for the building, in accordance with the terms of said treaty, of a deep-waterway channel connecting the Great Lakes with tidewater; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of this State is hereby requested to forthwith transmit to the Senate of the United States a properly authenticated copy of this joint resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Minnesota.

K. K. SOLBERG,
President of the Senate.
CHAS. MUNN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 22d day of December 1933.

G. H. SPAETH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 26th day of December 1933.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved December 27, 1933.

FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed December 28, 1933.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was ordered to lie on the table:

A concurrent resolution urging the United States Senate to approve the proposed treaty agreed upon between the United States and Canada for the improvement of the St. Lawrence River, so that ocean-going vessels from the Atlantic seaboard may reach the Great Lakes and the Port of Detroit

Whereas the consummation of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Treaty ends the age-long struggle of land-locked people to gain access to the sea; and

Whereas the joint undertaking for extending ocean carriage to the heart of the American continent is a major world accomplishment and sets a new mark in international cooperation; and

Whereas it now appears that there exists a real and imperative need for this waterway outlet which will greatly enhance the economic well-being of the people of the State of Michigan: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this first extra session of the 1933 Legislature of the State of Michigan request the Senate of the United States to delay no longer in bringing the matter of ratification of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty before that body for final consideration.

Adopted by senate November 27, 1933.

Adopted by house of representatives December 6, 1933.

ALLEN E. STEBBINS,
President of Senate.

DON W. CANFIELD,
Secretary of Senate.

MARTIN R. BRADLEY,
Speaker of House of Representatives.

MYLES F. GRAY,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

STATE OF MAINE, 1933.

Memorial to the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, recommending that the Federal Government establish an official gateway to Acadia National Park

We, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, in legislature assembled, most respectfully present and petition the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives, as follows:

Whereas Acadia National Park, with its scenic Mount Cadillac Drive and various other distinctive features, combining the beauties of the seacoast and mountain, is one of the country's outstanding parks; and

Whereas many citizens, through lack of information, do not realize the many scenic wonders that may be enjoyed; and

Whereas a bill will be introduced in the next Congress of the United States for the purchase of some 65 acres of land at Mount Desert Bridge, the point of entry on to Mount Desert Island, for the purpose of creating thereon an official entrance and gateway to Acadia National Park, together with an information house, an airport, and a landscape engineering department for the purpose of planning and maintaining landscape projects within the national park area and also highway beautification projects already established by the National Conservation Board; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Legislature of the State of Maine, believing that the proposed gateway to the Acadia National Park will result in giving more pleasure to the citizens who use it and greatly increase the facilities of the park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in Legislature assembled, That we urge the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to further and assist in the creation of the gateway to Acadia National Park; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be duly certified and sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Maine in the Congress of the United States.

IN SENATE CHAMBER, December 16, 1933.

Read and adopted. Sent down for concurrence.

ROYDEN V. BROWN, Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, December 16, 1933.

Read and adopted. In concurrence.

HARVEY R. PEASE, Clerk.

STATE OF MAINE.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Robinson C. Tobey, secretary of state of the State of Maine, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the memorial to the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in legislature assembled, with the original thereof, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed. Given under my hand at Augusta, this 16th day of December, A. D. 1933, and in the one hundred and fifty-eighth year of the independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL]

ROBINSON C. TOBEY,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, David C. Winebrenner, 3d, secretary of state of the State of Maryland, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 59 of article 35 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of Joint Resolution No. 1, of the acts of the extra session of the General Assembly of Maryland, which convened on the 23d day of November 1933, as the same is taken from and compared with the original joint resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed the official seal of the secretary of state, at Annapolis, Md., this 15th day of December in the year one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three.

[SEAL]

DAVID C. WINEBRENNER, 3d,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution expressing to the Federal Coordinator of Transportation and the Interstate Commerce Commission a protest against the so-called "Prince plan" for uniting the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad with the Pennsylvania Railroad

Whereas a proposal has been made by certain interests to the Federal Coordinator of Transportation, the Honorable Joseph B. Eastman, that he adopt and recommend the so-called "Prince plan" for the consolidation of railroads; and

Whereas said plan provides for but two systems in eastern trunk-line territory and would consolidate the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad with the Pennsylvania System as a part of so-called "system no. 2"; and

Whereas said plan for consolidation purposes to dismantle the Baltimore & Ohio as a system and to take up the railroad between Baltimore and Philadelphia and to reduce the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad to a single-track line between Baltimore and Chicago and St. Louis; to remove from it entirely all through freight and passenger business, reducing the remnants to a no. 2 branch-line status; furthermore, said plan proposes the abandonment of headquarters, shops, terminals, and other facilities accordingly; and

Whereas the Baltimore & Ohio, the premier railroad of our Nation, whose centenary was recently fittingly celebrated in Baltimore, was originally organized and constructed in Maryland and has been extended and developed into a great national

transportation system connecting with the other rail routes and with the seaways of our country and with its general headquarters, machine construction shops, and operating centers in Baltimore, Cumberland, and other Maryland cities; and

Whereas the transportation facilities of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad under independent operation are of inestimable advantage to the business, commerce, and industry, and to the labor employment, mining, agricultural, and shipping interests of Baltimore and Maryland; and

Whereas the unwilling divorcement of independent management and the forcible wedding of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad to the Pennsylvania Railroad, involving the shifting of headquarters, operating direction, and other facilities to Pennsylvania and Philadelphia and the subjection of this great transportation line to control in policy by another system would be deeply injurious to the interests of all Maryland, and of shareholders everywhere, as recently cogently expressed by resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore in opposition thereto; and

Whereas the people of Maryland desire to have and highly value the independent services of both of these great transportation lines, the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania Railroad; therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That it respectfully yet most emphatically and earnestly expresses its dissent to and protests against the consideration or adoption in whole or in part by the Coordinator of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other Federal authority, of the so-called "Prince plan" or the merger or consolidation of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad with the Pennsylvania Railroad; and

Resolved further, That copies of this joint resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of Maryland to the aforesaid Coordinator of Transportation, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the United States Senators and Representatives from Maryland, and to the President of the United States.

Approved December 15, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Whereas after the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States the National Prohibition Act may still remain in force in the Territory of Hawaii by virtue of the authority inherent in Congress to legislate directly in matters affecting a Territory which does not enjoy the sovereign powers of a State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That Congress be, and it is hereby, memorialized to repeal or so amend the National Prohibition Act that the provisions of the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States may, upon ratification, be made applicable to the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, November 14, 1933.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on November 14, 1933.

GEO. P. COOKE,
President of the Senate.
L. K. STERLING,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, November 14, 1933.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on November 13, 1933.

HERBERT N. AHUNG,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing Congress for the enactment of legislation to protect the American industry and the employees thereof against cheap foreign labor and products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. SHIPSTEAD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate petitions of officers of the New Deal Democratic Organization of Louisiana and sundry other citizens of that State, praying for the expulsion from the Senate of Hon. HUEY P. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, on account of certain

alleged acts and conduct, and also for the expulsion of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Women's Committee of Louisiana, praying for the expulsion from the Senate of Hon. HUEY P. LONG, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Women's Committee of Louisiana, of New Orleans, La., praying that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of certain charges heretofore filed against Hon. HUEY P. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, and that such charges be referred to another committee for investigation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from J. W. Longino, of Shreveport, La., favoring efforts of certain citizens looking to the expulsion of Hon. HUEY P. LONG and Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON from the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Good Citizenship League of Flushing, N.Y., favoring an investigation of alleged acts and conduct of Hon. HUEY P. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Louisiana, remonstrating against investigation of alleged acts and conduct of Hon. HUEY P. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from A. P. Taliaferro, of Mansfield, La., endorsing Hon. HUEY P. LONG and Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON as Senators from the State of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held on December 3, 1933, at the College of the City of New York, New York, N.Y., under the auspices of three faiths—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—severely condemning recent lynchings and favoring the passage of anti-lynching legislation, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by citizens of Washburn, Wis., favoring the prompt ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Council of Madison, Wis., the Council of Portland, Oreg., and the City Council of Tulare, Calif., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the issuance of national currency to municipalities on the pledge of their bonds, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of the Cragin State Bank Depositors Justice Committee and citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the creation of a Federal agency to take over all assets and liabilities of closed banks and pay depositors in full, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the executive committee of the Sheep and Goat Raisers Association of Texas, praying for the establishment of adequate agricultural credit-lending facilities in producing areas, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of John Karachon, of Newark, N.J., praying relief for injuries suffered while employed in private industry, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by citizens in mass meeting assembled at Portland, Oreg., favoring the hydroelectric development of the Columbia River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association at Baltimore, Md., favoring the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Teachers' College branch of the National Vocational Guidance Association at Columbia University, favoring direct Federal grants or loans for public education in the several States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from the Chamber of Representatives of the Republic of Cuba, favoring just and equitable reciprocity in tariff rates, especially in regard to the sugar industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Convention of American War Mothers, at Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the elimination of injustices to veterans and their dependents under the so-called "Economy Act", which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring liberal treatment to veterans and the rescinding of stringent regulations respecting veterans in national soldiers homes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the common council, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the creation of a Federal commission to examine into the whole existing structure of taxes and revenues, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of Portland, Oreg., favoring the taxation of present tax-exempt bonds and a lower rate of interest on such bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Indianola, Iowa, urging that war debts be used for the stabilization and the increase of the price of silver and the extension of our agricultural markets, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations at Chicago, Ill., and the World Court Committee of New Britain, Conn., favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations at Chicago, Ill., and by citizens in mass meeting at San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the treatment of Jews in Germany, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the District of Columbia Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, the Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs, at Detroit, Mich., and the Wheel of Progress, remonstrating against the recognition of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., favoring world peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at Aberdeen, S.Dak., favoring the regulation of trucks and busses engaged in interstate transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by members of the Holy Name Society assembled at Saginaw, Mich., favoring Federal supervision and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1933, at Columbus, Ohio, praying for Federal supervision and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Second Polish Workers Convention at Chicago, Ill., protesting against the mistreatment of women and girls in

factories, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of Harold G. Russell, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the confirmation of Philip L. Sullivan as judge of the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Oregon, Washington, and Montana Ninety-first Division Associations of American Expeditionary Forces, at Seattle, Wash., favoring the strengthening of the Army, and also the adequate protection of life and property, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, of San Francisco, Calif., accepting amendments pertaining to the construction of approach roads leading to the Golden Gate Bridge in the Presidio of San Francisco military reservation, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Binghamton, N.Y., accepting an exchange of land in that city from the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the New York Zoological Society, of New York City, favoring an international park and wilderness area in the Rainy River region on the Minnesota-Ontario border and the protection of wild life in reforestation work, and remonstrating against the introduction of commercial projects into Yellowstone National Park and the transfer of the administration of game laws in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Bakers' Association of Puerto Rico, praying for the nonapplication of the processing tax on flours imported from the United States into Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of Burgos, Ilocos Norte, P.I., favoring the immediate and unconditional independence of the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Alaska Native Brotherhood, at Juneau, Alaska, protesting against discrimination against natives of southeastern Alaska in the administration of relief, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Alaska Native Brotherhood at Juneau, Alaska, favoring fairer fishery laws for the natives of Alaska or the transfer of the so-called Panhandle of Alaska to the Canadian Government, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, of Beaumont, Tex., and the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, at Baltimore, Md., protesting against the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Berwyn, Ill., and the police jury of Bossier Parish, La., expressing confidence in and approval of the policies of President Roosevelt in dealing with the economic crisis, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., extending an invitation to the President and Vice President of the United States and certain Members of the Congress to participate in the Czechoslovak National Day in connection with A Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint resolution for transmission to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America relative to the presence of the Dutch Elm disease in this country and the need for its extermination

Whereas the presence of the European Dutch Elm disease in New Jersey has been brought to the attention of the Legislature of New Jersey; and

Whereas it is recognized by scientists that this disease of elms constitutes a menace of large proportions to New Jersey and to the Nation; and

Whereas the disease has also been found in States outside of New Jersey: Be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That adequate measures for the eradication of this disease be carried out under the authority of the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. That sufficient funds for eradication be allocated by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

3. A copy of this joint resolution shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to the Representatives of New Jersey in Congress.

Approved December 4, 1933.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Thomas A. Mathis, secretary of state of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a joint resolution passed by the legislature of this State, and approved by the Governor, the 4th day of December, A. D. 1933, as taken from and compared with the original now on file in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Trenton this 12th day of December 1933.

[SEAL]

THOMAS A. MATHIS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the following concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to protect American industry and the employees thereof against cheap foreign labor and products

Whereas the State of Minnesota and the city of Cloquet are directly interested in the manufacture of matches to the extent of several hundred persons being employed in that city in this industry; and

Whereas the dumping of foreign-made matches, notably from Japan, in this country, at prices which preclude competition by American-made matches, under the present standard of American living and wages; and

Whereas it will require governmental action against underpaid foreign labor, and drastic regulation against the product of people who work for a few cents a day and live almost wholly upon rice and fish; and

Whereas high labor costs in the American industry and very low labor costs in foreign match-manufacturing countries have made it impossible to compete in any other country with foreign match manufacturers; and

Whereas the American match industry has never had real tariff protection; and

Whereas this industry has been continually harassed by unfair importations of misbranded, mismarked, and inferior quality dumped matches; and

Whereas, foreign match manufacturers have been guilty of unscrupulous practices by coloring the splints and so reducing the duty paid to one third or less of the amount intended by Congress; and

Whereas during the past 3 years the Government has seen fit to prevent dumping of matches by nine European countries and Japanese importations have increased from 8,629 gross in June 1932, to 399,700 gross in September 1933, an increase of 4,532 percent; and

Whereas women in the Cloquet match factory under the N.R.A. are paid 30 cents per hour while women in Japanese match factories are paid 3 cents per hour; and

Whereas under present conditions, working under the match code, paying the high wages that the American industry does, competing with the low-cost matches from Japan and other countries, it is impossible for American manufacturers to compete and continue running unless something can be done in the near future; and

Whereas in the city of Cloquet, as a result of this unfair competition, 250 people have lost their employment, and the factory may suspend work permanently until the United States Government gives added protection against these foreign importations; and

Whereas if this suspension of operation takes place, the farmers of northern Minnesota and Wisconsin will lose from \$55,000 to \$84,000, annually, which is now paid to them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, the senate concurring herein, that we hereby respectively petition and urge Congress to pass appropriate legislation to protect this American industry and its employees by preventing the dumping of these unfair products, and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to forward a copy hereof to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State

of Minnesota in Congress of the United States, and a copy each to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, at Washington.

CHAS. MUNN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
K. K. SOLBERG,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 15th day of December 1933.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 18th day of December 1933.

G. H. SPAETH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved December 21, 1933.

FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed December 22, 1933.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State of Minnesota.

Mr. BULKLEY presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the excise tax on spirituous liquors

Whereas the Governor of Ohio has suggested in his message to the general assembly that the ninetieth general assembly in second special session assembled, memorialize Congress of the subject of taxation of liquors, urging and requesting them that taxes on spirituous liquors be not made so high as to make possible the continuation of existing bootlegging traffic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ninetieth General Assembly of the State of Ohio request that the Congress of the United States shall authorize the immediate consideration of such regulatory measures as it may deem necessary to prohibit illicit trafficking in spirituous liquors; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States and each of the Ohio Senators and Congressmen to lend their aid and support to enactment of such legislation at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both the United States Senators and each Member of Congress from Ohio, and to the chairman of the House and Senate committees of the Congress of the United States which have the proposed legislation under consideration.

FRANK CAVE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CHARLES SAWYER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted December 12, 1933.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A resolution memorializing the Senate of the United States to enact the Sumners bill H.R. 5950, or other similar legislation to provide for the temporary relief of insolvent municipalities and to preserve the taxable value of their property

Whereas the present financial crisis in the United States has made it impossible for cities and other governmental units in Michigan to collect enough money to maintain essential governmental services, such as fire, police, and health departments and at the same time pay interest and principal on maturing debts; and

Whereas many local governmental units in Michigan are threatened with a multiplicity of lawsuits which will further add to the tax burden and otherwise further handicap said local governments, and threaten to totally destroy local government and to endanger the lives and property of the citizens of the State of Michigan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State of Michigan, through its senate here assembled approves in principle the Sumners bill H.R. 5950, now pending, entitled "Provisions for the emergency temporary aid of insolvent public debtors and to preserve the assets thereof, and for other related purposes." It being understood that said bill provides in general that cities and other local units may file a petition in the Federal district court stating that the taxing district is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature, and that it desires to effect a plan of readjustment of its debts upon the basis of its capacity to pay. When such plan of debt readjustment has been approved by two thirds of the creditors affected the Federal court shall have authority to decree the plan so approved binding on all creditors, whether they have accepted or not; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Michigan Members of the United States Senate.

Adopted by the Senate December 19, 1933.

ALLEN E. STEEBINS,
President of the Senate.
DON W. CANFIELD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Ukrainians held at the United States Light Guard Armory, Hamtramck, Mich., favoring an investigation of the treatment accorded the people of the Soviet Ukraine, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALCOTT presented the following resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolution requesting the Senate of the United States to approve the ratification of the three pending World Court treaties at the earliest practicable time

Whereas many of the economic and financial problems now confronting the Nation and this State had their origin in the World War; and

Whereas one of the best means of avoiding future world catastrophes is to develop practicable methods for settling peacefully the international disputes that are bound to arise in increasing numbers as the web of international commercial and other relations grows steadily more complex; and

Whereas the World Court has proved itself in the 11 years of its existence capable of settling difficult and potentially dangerous questions of a class for which the judicial method is suitable by applying principles of international law, and has indeed successfully settled 45 such questions; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States on January 27, 1926, by a vote of 76 to 17, approved our adherence to the World Court if five conditions were met; and

Whereas these conditions are now fully met in the judgment of the Department of State and of such competent bodies as the American Bar Association and the Connecticut State Bar Association by the three treaties which have already been signed by the United States and which now await the Senate's consent to ratification; and

Whereas both the Democratic and Republican platforms of last June endorsed the completion of the adherence of the United States to the World Court: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the General Assembly of Connecticut respectfully requests the Senate of the United States to approve the ratification of the three pending World Court treaties at the earliest practicable time; and be it further

Resolved, That the senior Senator from this State is hereby requested to ask that this resolution be spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the World Court Committee of New Britain, Conn., favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Connecticut State Home Economics Association, at Storrs, and the Hartford Medical Society, of Hartford, both in the State of Connecticut, favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen the Pure Food and Drugs Act, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the disabled American veterans of the World War, and of sundry citizens, all of New Haven, Conn., praying a restoration of all benefits lost to service-connected veterans by the passage of the so-called "Economy Act", which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of sundry insurance company agencies and the Chamber of Commerce of Greenwich, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the debasement of the currency and favoring a continuance of a sound currency policy, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented the memorial of the Yalesville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Yalesville, Conn., remonstrating against the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, and also against the repeal of enforcement legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of the North End Federated Clubs, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation to abolish lynching, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Thomas L. Reilly Branch, No. 60, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the restoration of salaries reduced by the so-called "Economy Act", a guaranteed pay to substitute letter carriers each month, and a classification of all village

delivery offices as city delivery offices, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. FESS presented a resolution adopted by the Corn City Savings Association, of Toledo, Ohio, favoring loans by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to home owners distressed by delinquent taxes and inadequate earning power and for the purpose of making necessary repairs and improvements to their properties, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska praying for the repeal of the so-called "Economy Act" and the immediate cash payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL INSURANCE

Mr. DUFFY presented resolutions adopted by the common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, that it endorses State and Federal legislation having for its object the carrying of the burden of the support of those displaced in industry by present economic changes by governmental agencies such as Government unemployment and social insurance;

Resolved further, That the city clerk be and hereby is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to Congress, the county board of supervisors, and the Wisconsin Legislature.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, December 28, 1933.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, on December 26, 1933.

FRANK A. KRAWCZAK, City Clerk.

SURVEY OF CONDITIONS AMONG INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES (S.REPT. NO. 147)

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted a partial report pursuant to Senate Resolution 79, Seventieth Congress, and subsequent resolutions, on the development and leasing of the Flathead power sites, Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 1956) for the relief of the Acme Motor Truck Corporation; and

A bill (S. 1957) for the relief of Anna W. Dennert; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1958) for the relief of Lewis Marion Hall; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1959) granting a pension to Dorothy Crosby Allen;

A bill (S. 1960) granting a pension to Martha Adelaide Childs; and

A bill (S. 1961) granting a pension to Mary Ann Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 1962) for the relief of the First National Bank of Walthill, Thurston County, State of Nebraska; and

A bill (S. 1963) for the relief of Thomas J. Pryor; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1964) to amend section 801 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia with respect to the punishment of the offense of murder in the first degree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1965) for the relief of Charles Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1966) to investigate the claims of and to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 1967) to include cattle as a basic agricultural commodity under the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1968) for the relief of Jessie D. Bowman; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1969) granting a pension to Fred L. Dreehouse; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Charles H. Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1971) granting a pension to Leo P. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1972) for the relief of James W. Walters; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1973) to improve the navigability of the Missouri River; to provide for the flood control of the Mississippi River and the Missouri River; to provide for reforestation and the use of marginal lands in the Missouri Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the Mississippi Valley and the Missouri Valley; to provide for the irrigation of lands in the Missouri Valley; to provide for the restoration and preservation of the water level in the Missouri Valley; to provide for the flood control of the Missouri River and the Mississippi River; to provide for the development of electrical power in the Missouri Valley; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 1974) to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis and to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 1975) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH:

A bill (S. 1976) to provide for preliminary examination and survey of the channel from Rhodes River to Cadie Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., with a view to providing a navigable channel across Cherry Stone Bar; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 1977) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Brockton, Mont., in the extension of the public-school building at that place to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALCOTT:

A bill (S. 1979) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1982) to add certain lands to the Mount Hood National Forest in the State of Oregon; and

A bill (S. 1983) to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Fremont National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1984) granting the consent of Congress to the Oregon-Washington Bridge Co. to maintain a bridge already constructed across Youngs Bay near the city of Astoria, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 1985) relating to the amortization of the construction cost of certain toll bridges in the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 1986) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Willamette River, with a view to the controlling of floods; and

A bill (S. 1987) to develop American air transport services, to encourage the construction in the United States by American capital of American airships or other aircraft for use in foreign commerce, and to make certain provisions of the maritime law applicable to foreign commerce by airship or other aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1988) for the relief of the Fischer Flouring Mills, of Silverton, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1989) to amend the National Industrial Recovery Act with respect to the acquisition of public works projects; and

A bill (S. 1990) for the relief of contract veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Chinese Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

(A bill (S. 1991) granting a pension to Laura F. Helm (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1992) for the relief of Arthur R. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1993) for the relief of the Lower Salem Commercial Bank, Lower Salem, Ohio.

A bill (S. 1994) for the relief of Estelle Johnson; and

A bill (S. 1995) for the relief of John N. Brooks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 1996) for the relief of Major Thomas J. Berry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1997) to compensate Harriet C. Holaday; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A bill (S. 1998) for the relief of the estate of Martin Flynn; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1999) to repeal title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2001) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce;

A bill (S. 2002) for the relief of R. S. Howard Co., Inc.;

A bill (S. 2003) for the relief of Henry A. Richmond;

A bill (S. 2004) for the relief of Charles W. Smith; and

A bill (S. 2005) for the relief of Harriet T. Bottomley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2006) for the relief of Della D. Ledendecker; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2007) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2008) to amend the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2009) granting a pension to Libbie T. Marrah; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 2010) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Georgia, at or near Sea Island Beach; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCGILL:

A bill (S. 2011) granting a pension to Josephine Morton;

A bill (S. 2012) granting a pension to Wallace C. Harris;

A bill (S. 2013) granting a pension to Bertram Brown;

A bill (S. 2014) granting a pension to Mary Webb; and

A bill (S. 2015) granting a pension to Lucy Copeland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK:

A bill (S. 2016) relating to the transmission through the mails of advertisements of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2017) to repeal a part of section 5 of the National Recovery Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2018) relative to Members of Congress acting as attorneys in matters where the United States has an interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2019) to establish the Boise National Mountain Park in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2020) for the relief of Donald D. Rose and William Fandry; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2021) granting a pension to Anna Bierd, widow of William H. Dunlop (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2022) for the relief of S. C. Bakken;

A bill (S. 2023) for the relief of Miss Claudia L. Polski; and

A bill (S. 2024) for the relief of the heirs of John Booren, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2025) authorizing the appointment of Bernard C. Rose as a second lieutenant, Army Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2026) providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2027) granting a pension to Della M. C. Rudolph (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 2028) to provide an additional appropriation as the result of a reinvestigation, pursuant to the act of February 2, 1929 (45 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2047), for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosions at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N.J., July 10, 1926; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2029) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River near Trenton, N.J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Meyer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2031) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 2032) making it an offense against the United States to kill an officer or employee of the United States in or on account of the execution of his duty; and

A bill (S. 2033) to amend the act entitled "An act forbidding the transportation of any person in interstate or foreign commerce, kidnaped, or otherwise unlawfully detained, and making such act a felony", approved June 22, 1932; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2034) granting a pension to Ella Woodward;

A bill (S. 2035) granting a pension to Eliza Dutton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2037) to extend for 1 year the time during which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for financing the repair or reconstruction of buildings damaged by earthquake, fire, tornado, or cyclone; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2038) to repeal section 617 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2041) to amend the act of June 15, 1933, amending the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended;

A bill (S. 2042) to establish a department of physics at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N.Y.;

A bill (S. 2043) to amend the act of May 22, 1928, entitled "An act to authorize the collection, in monthly installments, of indebtedness due the United States from enlisted men, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 2044) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2045) to authorize the settlement of individual claims of military personnel for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, opera-

tion, or maintenance of the Army (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2046) to provide relief for disbursing officers of the Army in certain cases (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2047) to authorize credit in disbursing officers' accounts covering shipment of privately owned automobiles from October 12, 1927, to October 10, 1929 (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2048) to authorize the settlement of individual claims of military personnel for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2049) for the relief of the Western Electric Co., Inc. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2050) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of an individual claim approved by the War Department (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2051) to authorize settlement, allowance, and payment of certain claims (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2052) to credit certain services as cadets at the United States Military Academy (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2053) for the relief of Capt. L. P. Worrall, Finance Department, United States Army (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2054) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2055) to authorize the settlement, allowance, and payment of certain claims, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2056) to reimburse officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army and their families and dependents, or their legal representatives, for losses sustained as a result of the hurricane which occurred in Texas on August 16, 17, and 18, 1915 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2057) authorizing the sale of certain property no longer required for public purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2058) for the relief of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2059) placing John A. McAlister, Jr., on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2060) granting a pension to Fanny Jane Young Clyde Wall; and

A bill (S. 2061) granting a pension to Susan Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2062) authorizing loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to certain irrigation companies in connection with agricultural improvement projects; and

A bill (S. 2063) to establish a bimetallic system of currency, employing gold and silver, to fix the relative value of gold and silver, to provide for the free coinage of silver as well as gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2064) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution for a free and independent government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

A joint resolution (S.J.Res. 65) to provide old-age pensions at the rate of \$30 per month for all persons who are more than 60 years of age and possess property less than \$10,000 in value, or with a net income of less than \$1,000 per year; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CLARK:

A joint resolution (S.J.Res. 66) authorizing an appropriation for the acquisition of a suitable site, and the construction of a permanent memorial to the men who made possible the territorial expansion of the United States, particularly President Jefferson and his aides, who negotiated

the Louisiana Purchase, and the great explorers, Lewis and Clark, and the hardy hunters, trappers, frontiersmen, and pioneers and others who contributed to the territorial expansion and development of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALCOTT:

A joint resolution (S.J.Res. 67) directing the Comptroller General to adjust the account between the United States and the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself I introduce and send to the desk for appropriate reference a Federal anti-lynching bill.

The bill (S. 1978) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send to the desk two resolutions and a bill for appropriate reference.

The bill I am introducing proposes to amend and reenact the antitrust laws. I ask that the bill be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary, to which committee was referred a similar bill I introduced during the Seventy-second Congress, but on which there has never been any action.

I ask that the two resolutions which I have presented lie on the table, to come up under the rule, without being referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted for a moment. What was the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana introduced a bill, announcing that heretofore a similar bill had been introduced and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that no action had been taken on it, and he asks that the bill now introduced by him be referred to the same committee.

Mr. McNARY. Is the Judiciary Committee the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter covered by the bill?

Mr. LONG. Yes; it is a bill to reenact the antitrust laws. The former bill I introduced died in the committee during the Seventy-second Congress, and I am introducing the same bill in this Congress, and asking that it be referred to the same committee, which held hearings on the former bill.

Mr. BORAH. Did I understand the Senator to say that the bill was one seeking to reenact the antitrust laws?

Mr. LONG. To reenact and amend them; yes.

Mr. BORAH. They have not been repealed as yet.

Mr. LONG. I do not know; I have been trying to find that out.

Mr. BORAH. All the Senator has to do is to read the act.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, the Supreme Court on several occasions has ruled them out in establishing the "rule of reason", and I have worded the bill so that it will comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court, and will not depend upon the so-called "common law rule of reason"; that is all. I simply seek to make the law what it was before the Supreme Court annulled it. That is what I am really seeking to do.

The bill (S. 1980) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies was read twice by title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The resolutions submitted by Mr. Long appear under the appropriate headings.)

INCLUSION OF CATTLE IN AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas will proceed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress there was enacted what was called the Agricultural Adjustment Act. When that measure came before the Congress the question of whether or not cattle should be included was raised. Most of those engaged in the cattle industry in the United States asked that cattle be not included. Since that time, however, there has been a great change in sentiment among the cattle interests, because they have suffered very greatly on account of depressed prices and on account of general conditions affecting the industry. My State is one of the largest cattle-producing States in the Union, and I want to ask consent at this time to introduce a bill placing cattle under the Agricultural Adjustment Act as a basic commodity. I may say in this connection that the Secretary of Agriculture is heartily in favor of the inclusion of cattle, and I understand from his attitude that the proposition, of course, will have the backing of the administration. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is the Senator's bill in the form of an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is designed to amend the act by including cattle.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, it is a question which will have to be considered. Has the Senator requested that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to have it go to that committee, if there be no objection.

Mr. McNARY. That is the place where it should go.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not objecting to having it go there.

Mr. McNARY. What has the Senator requested be done with the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill has not been referred as yet.

Mr. McNARY. It should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We debated that question at the time the original act was passed, and cattle were not included in its provisions because we wanted to do what it was thought was beneficial for the industry.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am agreeable that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be so referred.

The bill (S. 1981) to make cattle a basic agricultural commodity for the purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REGULATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill as a substitute for Senate bill 1944, known as the "food and drugs bill." The original bill which I presented met with violent opposition from every section of the country, and the new bill is intended to be a substitute for the other, and I hope it will be reasonably satisfactory to all parties.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was not able to hear all the Senator said in connection with the bill he is presenting. Is this bill a substitute for the bill upon which a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce has been holding hearings?

Mr. COPELAND. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought I heard the Senator say that he is introducing this new bill because there are objections to the other bill. Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. COPELAND. The other bill the committee found to be really objectionable in certain particulars. After a study of the problems and the criticisms presented, a new bill was prepared and submitted to the subcommittee. It is now introduced, with the request that it be referred to the Commerce Committee, in order that it may go to the subcommittee for further consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the Senator that he probably will not be able to introduce a bill on this subject which will not meet with some objection—

Mr. COPELAND. I realize that.

Mr. NORRIS. Unless the Senator introduces a bill which will not hurt anybody, and such a bill would do nobody any good.

Mr. COPELAND. This new bill will not be wholly satisfactory to the manufacturing interests or to those who are brought under control. But from considerable experience in connection with this matter, I do feel that the bill which I am now introducing is a better bill, and it is so regarded by all those who have given it study. The consumer is fully protected.

The bill (S. 2000) to prevent the manufacture, shipment, and sale of adulterated or misbranded food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics, and to regulate traffic therein; to prevent the false advertisement of food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RESTORATION OF PAY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to restore the pay of Government employees, which have been so unjustly slashed.

The bill (S. 2039) to repeal certain provisions of law relating to economies in the National Government, to discontinue reductions in certain Government salaries, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESTORATION OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I also introduce a bill to repeal the so-called "Economy Act" in its entirety, and to restore to the veterans the benefits of which they have been so unjustly deprived. I ask that the bill may be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2040) to restore veterans' benefits was read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES—AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution with respect to tax-exempt securities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J.Res. 68) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the taxation of tax-exempt securities was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOREIGN DEBTS

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The resolution (S.Res. 109) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to send to the Senate a statement relative to the debts due to this Government from foreign governments, giving the amount due and in default, both principal and interest, from the respective governments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, personally I have no objection to the resolution, and will probably support it, but only a few Senators are in the Chamber, the resolution presents a large subject, and I think it should lie over for the day.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the resolution simply calls for information. It requests the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a statement of facts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator presenting the resolution anticipates a prolonged discussion.

Mr. BORAH. No. It is simply a resolution calling for a statement of facts, showing what is now due from certain foreign governments, and in default.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FORM OF CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION OF APPOINTMENT OF A SENATOR

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Committee on Rules, in revising the Senate Manual, among other defects found that the form for certificates of election, which is found on page 8, will not now be acceptable, because the date of the beginning of the service fixed in the certificate is the 4th of March. The purpose of the resolution which I am presenting is to change the date to the 3d of January, the date fixed by the constitutional amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution (S.Res. 110) was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the following are convenient and sufficient forms of certificate of election of a Senator or the appointment of a Senator, to be signed by the executive of any State in pursuance of the Constitution and the Statutes of the United States:

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the — day of —, 19—, A — B — was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of — a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 19—.

"Witness: His Excellency our Governor —, and our seal hereto affixed at —, this — day of —, in the year of our Lord 19—.

"By the Governor:

"C — D —,

"Governor.

"E — F —,

"Secretary of State."

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of —, I, A — B —, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint C — D — a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the — of E — F —, is filled by election, as provided by law.

"Witness: His Excellency our Governor —, and our seal hereto affixed at — this — day of —, in the year of our Lord 19—.

"G — H —,

"Governor.

"I — J —,

"Secretary of State."

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall send copies of these suggested forms and these resolutions to the executive and secretary of each State wherein an election is about to take place or an appointment is to be made in season that they may use such forms if they see fit.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 111) which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds hereby is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST RIVERS AND HARBORS AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following resolution (S.Res. 112), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and they are hereby, amended by adding after rule XX a new rule, relating to river and harbor projects, as follows:

"RULE XXI. When a rivers and harbors authorization bill is pending a point of order may be made against the authorization of any project in any form not formally recommended to the Congress in an official report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

LIMITATION ON INCOME AND WEALTH

Mr. LONG submitted a resolution (S.Res. 113), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States, and that it accordingly does instruct the Senate Finance Committee, that it reform all revenue bills coming before it during the Seventy-third Congress, so that no person shall have an annual income in excess of \$1,000,000; so that no person during his or her lifetime shall receive by gifts, inheritances, or other bequests more than \$5,000,000; and so that all estates shall be limited so as not to exceed \$50,000,000 to the person, all surplus above such allowances to become payable to the Government, in cash or in kind, on such terms as may be prescribed by said Finance Committee.

TAXATION OF INCOME FROM UNITED STATES SECURITIES

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S.Con.Res. 6) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that all the income and interest from all bonds or other certificates of indebtedness hereafter issued by the Government of the United States shall be taxable by the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 7 minutes on the proposed taxation of the income and interest on Government bonds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator has permission to speak for 7 minutes.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, on March 10, 1933, I introduced a joint resolution (S.J.Res. 7) proposing to amend the Constitution, granting to the United States the power, after the ratification, to lay and collect taxes on incomes derived from securities issued under the authority of any State or of the United States. The joint resolution is as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 7

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on certain incomes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of any State but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of such State."

Mr. President, in introducing my joint resolution, I pioneered no new movement, but only resumed the task that was begun by more capable hands than my own, for it will be remembered that in the Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, Mr. William R. Green, of Iowa, introduced House Joint Resolution 314, of which my joint resolution is an identical copy, and it will, of course, also be remembered that Mr. Green's resolution on January 23, 1923, received the required two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives, but was not agreed to by the Senate. The vote in the House was yeas 223, nays 101, answered present 3, not voting 101.

Many lawyers, respectable in ability, are of opinion, in view of the sixteenth amendment, that no further constitutional amendment is necessary in order to lay and to collect taxes on incomes and interest derived from securities issued by the United States or by any State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean that that can be done with respect to State bond issues?

Mr. ASHURST. Only by constitutional amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am speaking now only of State securities and Federal taxation of income from State securities.

Mr. COSTIGAN rose.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, is it not the judgment of the able Senator from Arizona that the preponderance of

legal opinion upholds the necessity for a constitutional amendment if securities now exempt are to be effectively taxed?

Mr. ASHURST. I must admit that the majority opinion of the bar is that a constitutional amendment is required.

Moreover we may not ignore the following recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, holding that the sixteenth amendment did not extend the taxing power to any new class of subjects, but merely removed all occasion, which otherwise might exist, for an apportionment among the States, of taxes laid on income, whether it be derived from one source or another. (*Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co.*, 240 U.S. 1; *Peck & Co. v. Lowe*, 247 U.S. 165, 172; *Eisner v. Macomber*, 252 U.S. 189; *Evans v. Gore*, 253 U.S. 245, 259; *Metcalf and Eddy v. Mitchell*, *Admr.*, 269 U.S. 514, 521.)

Therefore, in view of these decisions, expensive and protracted litigation may be avoided by this amendment, which if submitted by the Congress would probably be ratified by the States before the question could directly and finally be decided by the courts.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the Senator's amendment proposes to authorize Congress to levy taxes upon incomes of individuals derived from State bonds, for instance?

Mr. ASHURST. It is reciprocal.

Mr. President, it is interesting to observe that the first exemption of income of State and municipal bonds from such taxation was announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in its famous decision, declaring all Federal income taxes unconstitutional. (*Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U.S. 429 et seq.)

Should my proposed amendment be submitted and ratified, the case of *Pollock* against *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* will have the unique distinction of bringing two amendments to the Constitution, or rather two amendments were required to overcome the effects of that decision.

My proposed amendment strikes at an evil in our system of taxation which is already great, and if unchecked, will grow—indeed has grown—to such magnitude as to threaten the existence of our institutions. We must assume that the Constitution of the United States, as it now stands, not only permits the issuance of tax-exempt securities by both the Federal and the State Governments but prevents the Federal Government on the one hand from levying an income tax on securities issued by the several States, and the States on the other hand, from levying an income tax on the securities issued by the Federal Government.

Students of our form of government recognize, of course, that the question is complicated owing to the very nature of our constitutional system of dual Governments, Federal and State.

The existence of conditions that enable any municipality or political subdivision to issue tax-free securities directly permits a certain class of property owners to partake of the comforts and benefits of Government without bearing any share of the expense-burden of Government.

All private property should pay its just proportion of the expense of maintaining the Government.

The issuance of tax-exempt securities permits:

- (1) A large portion of property to escape taxation, thereby causing great loss of revenue;
- (2) It violates the sound tax principle of "ability to pay" and it unfairly discriminates among taxpayers;
- (3) It discourages investment in new enterprises;
- (4) It encourages extravagances of governmental agencies;
- (5) It grants private subsidies and special privileges, obnoxious to our system;
- (6) By withdrawing money from private enterprises it increases the rate of interest required for all enterprises not carried on by the Government and thereby adds to the cost of living;
- (7) It creates, and quite naturally, social unrest.

It will be observed that the form of my amendment forbids discrimination against securities issued by the States, or under their authority, in favor of national securities, and that the States, on the other hand, are forbidden to discriminate against the securities issued by the Federal Government.

Vigor and vision are the supreme need of the hour, and unless we act with promptness on this subject, the National Government and some of the States will bog down and sink into the grasp of the all-smothering, all-destroying quicksands of insolvency.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Passing over the general considerations affecting the policy of issuing tax-exempt securities, it is apparent that the Senator's resolution is intended to ban the issuance hereafter of any tax-exempt securities by the Federal Government.

Mr. ASHURST. Quite correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wonder if the Senator has considered the effect of changing the policy at this juncture, on the ability of the Treasury to refund the \$4,000,000,000 of obligations maturing during the present year, and to obtain the \$6,000,000,000 of new money that will be necessary in order to make provision for the recovery program?

Mr. ASHURST. I am obliged to the able Senator for his searching and proper question.

I am not a member of the Finance Committee. Moreover, Mr. President, it is no news to the Senate that I am not an expert in fiscal affairs. Responding directly to the question of the Senator from Arkansas, I did counsel with some representative members of the administration, the Treasury Department, and consulted with not a few financial institutions, and they were unanimous in the opinion that the refusal hereafter to issue Federal tax-exempt securities would not in the least hamper the Government in refinancing, for the reason that thousands of persons have money locked up who are willing and anxious to buy Government securities, even at a reduced rate of interest and without the tax-exempt feature.

I was pleasantly surprised to discover a large number of persons of opulence who said, "We should be glad, so far as we are concerned, if you would remove tax-exempt privileges on United States bonds."

REFERENCE OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the order which I send to the desk, and to which I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon. It is the same that has been heretofore entered from time to time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on calendar days of the present session of the Congress when no executive session is held, nominations or treaties received from the President of the United States may, where no objection is interposed, be referred, as in executive session, to the appropriate committees by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. That conforms to the general practice. I have no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be entered.

ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on page 4 of the list of nominations received today I find the following general statement:

Also a number of promotions in the United States Army.

Heretofore, as I recall the practice, all nominations have been submitted by naming the individual, so that each Senator may know for whom he is voting or urge any criticism he may have as to the nominee's ability or character. To make a general statement that hereafter at some time a number of Army promotions may come before the Senate,

without naming the individuals, I think is not fair to the Senate, and I should like to have an understanding with the Senator from Arkansas relative to that general statement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it has been the practice to list the nominations, even though they are routine nominations, and I think that practice had best be pursued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair say to the Senator from Oregon that he is informed by the clerk that they are listed in the official communications sent to the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. They are not, however, listed in the printed list that has been supplied to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that that is a memorandum, but that the official list contains the names.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest that the names of all nominees be printed on the list that is supplied. I think it would be convenient to have that done.

Mr. McNARY. That is substantially my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the nominations as sent to the Senate will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. That, I am sure, will meet the suggestion.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Under the order previously entered today, sundry executive nominations were referred by the Vice President to the appropriate committees.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is pending in the Committee on the Judiciary a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States by the abolishment of the electoral college. There has been prepared an article bearing particularly on that subject, though it bears the title "Some Obsolete Features of our Federal Constitution." This article has been prepared by Judge Charles Sumner Lobinger, professor of comparative law in the National University, of Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that Judge Lobinger's article be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EVASION OF TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance a communication from Mr. C. G. Cunningham, of Pittsburgh, Pa. The communication has reference to legislation affecting prevention of tax avoidance.

The communication was ordered to be referred to the Committee on Finance and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRATT & WHITNEY CO.,
Hartford, Conn., January 2, 1934.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: We respectfully call your attention to H.R. 5904, passed at the last session of Congress by the House, and now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, being an act entitled, "To validate collections of internal-revenue taxes stayed by requests or claims for credit, and for other purposes", and to the recommendation (part II, no. 29, at p. 22) of the report of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee entitled, "Prevention of tax avoidance", this particular recommendation being that the provisions of H.R. 5904 be incorporated into the proposed general revenue bill.

We desire to enter our protest against this proposed legislation as most unfair and discriminatory, and we respectfully request your consideration of the following reasons against its enactment:

The proposed provisions relate only to taxes assessed prior to June 2, 1924, almost 10 years ago, and to credits made prior to May 29, 1928, against those taxes. Legislation at this late date to deprive taxpayers of rights accrued to them under the laws in effect during the period from 10 years to 5 years ago is repugnant to every principle of fair and honest dealings between the Government and its citizens.

The bill (H.R. 5904) is divided into two parts, the first part relating to cases where claims for credit, or written requests therefor, were filed and the collection of the assessed tax thereby postponed; and the second part relates to credits made in a limited class of cases where no claim or request for credit was filed.

However, the caption of the bill, and the only statements made on the floor of the House at the time the bill was passed by the House, created the erroneous impression that the entire bill applies only to cases where collection was stayed or postponed by claims for credit (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 73d Cong., 1st sess., p. 5329).

An examination of the RECORD above referred to indicates that the bill must have passed the House on the understanding that it applied only to cases where an extension of time had been granted by the Government by reason of the filing of a claim for credit. The fact of the matter is that the mere filing of a claim for credit did not extend the time for payment of a tax and the Internal Revenue Bureau has consistently so ruled. (For example, see I.T. 1373, C.B. I-1, p. 318, published June 1922.)

Probably the most objectionable feature of the proposed legislation is that it results in discrimination by the Government between taxpayers. It proposes to repeal the statute of limitations as to some taxpayers while giving the benefit of that statute to the great majority of taxpayers. It has been the consistent policy of the Government to fix the period of limitation for the collection of taxes, and such a statute of limitations should be applied to all taxpayers equally and without discrimination. The statute of limitations has been applied as enacted by Congress and interpreted by the Supreme Court to the great majority of cases, but now it is proposed by legislation at this late date to repeal the statute as to a few taxpayers who have not been able to persuade the Government to allow their claims or who have been unfortunate enough to have them delayed in litigation. It should not be forgotten in this connection that a similar statute of limitations protects the Government from having to refund taxes erroneously and illegally collected unless a claim therefor is filed within a fixed period of time. Many millions of dollars otherwise properly refundable have been retained by the Government on this ground. It is highly improper for the Government to claim the benefits of our statute of limitations, which enables it to retain taxes overpaid, and at the same time to deny the benefits of a corresponding statute of limitations to a small group of taxpayers whose cases are now pending in court.

In our own case suit was filed in the Court of Claims on May 2, 1929, and the evidence was completed on July 17, 1930. Shortly thereafter counsel for the Government recommended that the claim should be paid, and accordingly at the request of the Government a motion to dismiss was filed in escrow with the attorneys for the Government on the assumption that the recommendation of counsel would be promptly followed and the claim paid. However, the Treasury Department declined to follow the recommendation of its counsel and now, after delaying the case in litigation, it is proposed to pass legislation which will prevent the court from awarding judgment.

In the meantime many cases have been decided in the courts in which the taxpayers have been given the benefit of the statute of limitations as interpreted by the Supreme Court in such cases as *Bowers v. New York & Albany Lighterage Co.*, 273 U.S. 346; *United States v. Swift & Co.*, 282 U.S. 468; *United States v. Boston Buick Co.*, 282 U.S. 476; *Girard Trust Co. v. United States*, 270 U.S. 163; and *Pottstown Iron Co. v. United States*, 282 U.S. 479. In hundreds of other cases which were not taken to court the Bureau of Internal Revenue applied the rules laid down by the courts in the above-decided cases. If *Swift & Co.*, *New York & Albany Lighterage Co.*, *Boston Buick Co.*, *Pottstown Iron Co.*, *Girard Trust Co.*, and hundreds of other taxpayers have been given the benefit of the interpretation placed upon the statute of limitations by the courts, it seems a most unjustifiable kind of a discrimination to now pass a law that will take away from us and a few other taxpayers the benefits of the same statute of limitations. Certainly fair and honest dealing with its citizens and taxpayers should be of more importance to the Government than the saving of a few dollars.

Whatever possible virtue there may be for the first part of the proposed bill on the ground that the taxpayer may have been partly responsible for causing delay through the filing of claims for credit, none whatever can be found to support the second part of the bill. That is recognized in the statement made by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee regarding the subcommittee's report. On this point the Acting Secretary of the Treasury said:

"(29) *Claims for credit.*—The Treasury believes that the provisions of H.R. 5904, passed by the House at the last session, should be included in the new revenue bill so far as they pertain to cases where the making of the credit was delayed by the Commissioner because of the filing of a claim for credit by the taxpayer, but it does not believe there should be included those provisions which pertain to credits made by the Commissioner after the statutory period of limitation expired through no fault of the taxpayer."

The bill appears to have originated as a means to defeat certain suits pending against the Government which would have to be decided in favor of the taxpayer on the basis of decisions in the Supreme Court in the cases previously referred to. It is an attempt to reverse by legislation the decisions of the Supreme Court interpreting statutes enacted by Congress many years ago. As the bill is wholly retrospective relating solely to credits which have been made prior to 1928, and most of them several years prior thereto, it is a clear attempt to make a legislative decision of litigated cases now pending in the courts. Such an invasion of the judicial function should not be countenanced by the Congress.

Congress has passed the internal revenue laws and enacted statutes of limitations in connection therewith and these have been interpreted by the Supreme Court. Thereby definite rules

have been laid down and applied consistently to the cases of hundreds and probably thousands of taxpayers. Those rules should not now be changed by retrospective legislation to make a discriminatory application to a few taxpayers for the purpose of defeating suits against the Government which under the rules announced by the Supreme Court and uniformly applied by the Internal Revenue Bureau heretofore would require judgments in favor of the taxpayer.

We earnestly hope that for the reasons above stated you will conclude that the proposed legislation should not be enacted.

Very truly yours,

C. G. CUNNINGHAM.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY EDWARD A. HAYES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of a radio address delivered by Edward A. Hayes, national commander of the American Legion, under the auspices of the American Alliance of the United States, over the National Broadcasting Co. network on November 25, 1933, on the subject of Soviet Propaganda in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES

At the outset of my remarks on the subject of Soviet propaganda in the United States in which all of us are, or should be, vitally interested, and which is highly controversial at this time, I wish to make this point clear: Being one of the legionnaires who organized to promote our country's welfare, I conceive it my duty not to criticize in any way the constituted authorities of our country. I reiterate in every address I make, that so far as the national commander of the Legion is concerned this year, there never will be any adverse political criticism of our Chief Executive of the United States. But, in Chicago, the national convention gave me some orders. They are orders to all legionnaires. When we differ honestly in opinion with the Chief Executive, then it is our duty to say in terms which cannot be misunderstood what we were told to say by the Chicago convention.

One of these orders was specific, telling me that we should oppose, with every ounce of energy possible, the recognition of Soviet Russia. But just the other day our Government took steps which, at least commercially, recognized the Soviet Russian Government. Insofar as the actual act of recognition is concerned it is almost a closed book. Recognition now is the attitude of our country. There remains only the Senate confirmation of the ambassadors and the necessary appropriation to provide for ours. Meanwhile, the United States ambassador will go ahead with his diplomatic duties.

But there is one thing that I cannot refrain from speaking about if I am to do my duty. I was also instructed by the national convention to do a thing, which in my humble judgment, is the duty of every citizen to do. Unless we act on it, we might just as well forget about Americanism, and the principles and ideals that surround the bronze plaques that have been erected for the hero dead throughout this broad land of ours. Why? Well, I will be specific:

Here in Chicago for years, the representatives of the American Legion on the 1st day of May personally observe a meeting which is held here. It is attended by thousands of our school children. They sing the "Internationale", the red anthem, and use abusive language with relation to the flag which we revere. Those youngsters, some of them coming out of our public schools, are taught that it is wrong to have anything to do with democratic ideals; that they should do everything within their power to tear down the belief in democracy. They decry everything that we of the Legion try to do in the way of upholding our patriotism and Americanism.

Our duty in this regard, as I see it and as the national convention of the Legion has seen it, is to stop the dissemination of communistic propaganda within this beloved country of ours; that we must be doing something specific to put down their sort of activity in our schools.

It may sound strange to some parents listening in for the national commander to say to you that he can demonstrate, particularly in some of our institutions of higher learning, that there are so-called "professors" who take their students outside of their ordinary curriculum and say to them: "Learn these things." I could name one denominational university—but I won't name it here because it is denominational—because I would not speak in disparagement of any denomination—where the American Legion found an individual teaching his class outside of ordinary school hours that they should forget about their belief in God.

We could take you into other institutions. I was in New York the other day when there appeared in the press the story of 2,000 students of a great university there adopting a resolution in which they said that under no circumstances, in the event of war, would they follow the dictates of the War Department.

Recognition or no recognition, it is the duty of every American citizen to see to it specifically, that some provision is made by our Federal Government to provide appropriations so that there will be some agency within this country charged with the responsibility of putting down, suppressing, that sort of activity

which has been and is now going on in this United States of ours.

Do you realize, as American citizens, that there is no appropriation for the Department of Justice today that would allow that Department to do that thing? There is none; and it is your obligation, and mine, to see that it is provided.

Let us be a little more specific: I am informed, with the authority of a Member of Congress, that under the date of November 16, 1933, Maxim Litvinoff wrote to the Chief Executive of the United States the following:

"I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: (4) Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of or bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories, or possessions."

This agreement, I am told, went into effect immediately with recognition. Now, my friends, does not that pledge mean that the Communist International, with its headquarters in Moscow, must be disbanded or even put out of Russia? As long as it is in Moscow you and I know it will continue to be a part and parcel of the Communist Party and of the Soviet Government, and subsidized by them; that it will continue to spread its vicious revolutionary propaganda in all countries of the world that are not communistic.

There can be no difficulty in understanding that. However, despite this assurance that was made a provision to recognition, we have the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States of America, which is a section of the Communist International, all of which is printed daily in its newspaper, continuing to urge the overthrow of our political and social order.

If Mr. Litvinoff means what he says in the letter the Communist International in Moscow should be disbanded. The American Legion, being practical, is interested in seeing that Congress provides the funds to make possible the suppression of revolutionary propaganda.

No one familiar with the Communist movement takes their promise regarding activities in this country with any degree of trust. The admitted purpose of the Communist International of Moscow is the overthrow of all noncommunist governments by force and violence and the establishment of a world union of soviet socialist republics.

Let us be specific again and quote from this Daily Worker, the official Communist newspaper. A recent editorial, after the agreement had been reached through recognition negotiations between our Chief Executive and Maxim Litvinoff, states in part as follows: "All attempts of the Roosevelt regime to stem the deepening economic and financial crisis have failed. The N.R.A. as a means of solving the crisis is collapsing." Then, after claiming that recognition was forced on the United States by economic pressure from the Soviet Union, the editorial continues: "The Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International, points out that the only guarantee of peace is the abolition of capitalism. Its main task is the abolition of capitalism in the United States. In this country the Communist Party, section of the Communist International, basing itself on the principles of Lenin and Stalin, will more determinedly than ever strive to win the American workers for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, for the emulation of the Soviet Union and its revolutionary victories."

This without doubt is a direct advocacy of revolution and the establishment of a soviet form of government in this country.

Again let us be specific. The National Patriotic Council at its annual board meeting of November 20 pointed to a statement of a man who at that time was a high official of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in which this was said: "We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace. It would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the bit of paper we should sign. We should use the breathing space so obtained in order to gather our strength in order that the mere continued existence of our government would keep up the world-wide propaganda which Soviet Russia has been carrying on for more than a year." And here is another statement from another official who said: "As long as there are still idiots to take our signature seriously and to put their trust in it, we promise everything that is being asked and as much as one likes if we can only get something tangible in exchange."

It was pointed out by the council that evidence confiscated in raids in China, Mexico, Great Britain, and elsewhere on soviet trade agencies, embassies, and consulates proved that Moscow's revolutionary hand was fomenting discord within those nations while agreements not to do so were in existence. It called attention of the American people to the fact that although diplomatic recognition now exists all the principal Communist agitational machinery is still operating in the United States with a firm announcement that it will continue, and that the various publications still carry the public notice of Moscow affiliation. It is pointed out that the Third International of Moscow is still headed by Stalin and other chief officials of the Soviet Government, and that the Communist movement in the United States and all other nations are acknowledged sections of the Third International.

Why go on, my friends? Congressional committee hearings held all over this country piled up volume after volume of damning evidence of the revolutionary activities of Soviet Russia in this Na-

tion. The tentacles of Moscow reach out for the minds of our children with one purpose, and one only—to eventually destroy the Government of the United States and make of us a soviet socialist unit of their Republics. They seek to do it with bloodshed if necessary.

The point with which the American Legion is now concerned, conceding as we must that recognition itself is a closed door, for the time being, anyway, is whether we can believe that revolutionary propaganda will cease as has been pledged. We question whether one statement has not been made for one group and an entirely different statement made to another.

We have Mr. Litvinoff writing the Chief Executive a certain pledge that no group—note the wording; not the Third International, but no group—will be allowed to stay in Russia if its aim is to spread revolutionary propaganda in this country. Now, let us understand exactly the meaning of the Third International. It is not difficult. A mass of testimony has been taken about it. There was the first, which died, and then the second, which died, and now we have the Third International.

The third one was formed in 1919 by a convention of Communist delegates in Russia for the purpose of conducting a world party. The Communist Party in the United States is one unit. The purpose of the parent organization in Russia is to carry on throughout the world the revolutionary ambitions of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. How is it tied in with the Russian Soviet Government? That is explained in the report of the special congressional committee investigating Communist activities in the United States. "The Communist International (or Third International) is dominated by the Russian Communist Party and Soviet officials, and could not exist without the wholehearted support of the leaders of the Russian Communist Party and the financial backing of the Soviet Government. The two most important and powerful men in Russia—the Communist dictator, who now holds two Soviet posts, and the chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars—are on the select committee that plans and controls all the policies of the international."

Now, what does Mr. Litvinoff, the negotiator of the Russian Soviet Government for recognition (or, in the words of Will Rogers, the man who granted recognition to the United States)—what does he think of that pledge he made? We have it in the official newspaper of the Communists, the Daily Worker, of November 20. He is asked: "How does your agreement with President Roosevelt on propaganda affect the Third International?" Here is his reply: "The Third International is not mentioned in this (the recognition) document." Litvinoff smiled, apparently ready for the question. Then he added: "You must not read more into the document than was intended."

In connection with the revolutionary propaganda of the Communists in this country, directed as they are from Moscow, we often hear the question raised of free speech. Let us pause for a moment to review what the United States Supreme Court has said on this subject: "That a State in the exercise of its police powers may punish those who abuse this freedom by utterances inimical to the public welfare, tending to corrupt public morals, incite to crime, or disturb the public peace, is not open to question. And yet, for more imperative reasons, a State may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means. Freedom of speech does not protect disturbances to the public peace or the attempt to subvert the Government. It does not protect publications or teachings which tend to subvert or imperil the Government. In short, this freedom of speech does not deprive a State of the primary and essential right of self-preservation which, so long as human governments endure, they cannot be denied."

Just one more point and I will close. I now quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-third Congress, first session: "Italy's 2-year experiment of trading with Soviet Russia has ended in regret and a determination not to renew it. At the end of the first year Italy found she had imported \$29,000,000 worth and sold \$14,000,000. In the second year the adverse balance was cut to \$5,000,000. Moreover, Italy paid largely in cash. The Soviet paid mostly in credit. Most of this paper is still unliquidated, since the Bank of Italy will not rediscount it."

The announcement has been made that recognition means the United States and Soviet Russia will resume trade, and it is explained this trade will be on the premise that we extend the credit necessary. I must leave with you this thought: There recently was an announcement made that a quarter of a billion dollars had been cut from the compensation of our disabled veterans in America. They cannot take a quarter of a billion dollars away from our disabled veterans without taking clothing, food, and other necessities of life away from the children of those helpless men. If we are to extend credit anywhere, do we not have a great potential buying power within our own United States among the men and women who have proven their loyalty to the flag of the United States? They are men and women who, in all justice, are deserving of more consideration than we have agreed now to extend to the Communist Soviet Russia that seeks our Nation's downfall.

THE PRESIDENT'S SILVER PROCLAMATION

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain correspondence and statements relative to the purpose and effect of the President's silver proclamation ratifying the London agreement.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1934.

Mr. AXEL P. RAMSTEDT, President,
Wallace Board of Trade, Wallace, Idaho.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of December 30, you do not have to avail yourself of the coinage of silver under the President's proclamation, or, in other words, you do not have to sell your silver to the United States Government.

The President, under the Thomas amendment, was authorized to fix the ratio of gold and silver at any ratio fixed by the London Conference. The London Conference refused to endorse the free coinage of silver, or to fix any ratio between gold and silver. The President's proclamation was intended for the purpose of carrying out the London agreement so as to limit the silver supply in the future to mined production.

The price of 64½ cents an ounce was not intended to fix the price of silver forever. It was a price substantially 50 percent above the then world market price.

I should think that every miner in the United States would be gratified for such liberality, especially as most of the President's economic advisers suggested a much lower price.

This proclamation in no way whatever interferes with Congress. In my opinion it will aid Congress, because it is much easier to obtain the free coinage of silver at a valuation of \$1.29 an ounce when silver is 64½ cents an ounce in the world, or at least in the United States, than it would be if silver were 44 cents an ounce.

The Government is obligated to take 24,000,000 ounces of silver in 1934 from American production. That will be the total production of the United States in 1934. If the world price of silver moves up to 64½ cents an ounce, or slightly above it, then the President will issue another proclamation raising the price of silver in the United States so that he can obtain the American production that he is obligated to take. So it will be with Canada, Mexico, Australia, and Peru.

It is evident that the world supply of silver for 1934 will be limited to mined supply through the London agreements, which will only be 160,000,000 ounces or thereabouts. Such will be substantially 30 percent below the normal world supply.

The use of silver coins to replace low-valued paper currency under the London agreements will increase the demand for silver. Industrial recovery throughout the world will advance more rapidly than the production of silver. These things clearly indicate that there will be an insufficient supply of silver in 1934 to meet the increased demands.

This law of supply and demand will inevitably cause bidding for silver, which will result in a rising price.

It is not improbable that under these natural laws sustained by the London agreements silver will rise to parity, that is, \$1.29 an ounce, before the end of 1934.

Now, this Congress may pass an act for the free and unlimited coinage of all silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Personally, I think it would be a great benefit to the United States and the rest of the world. I have no fear whatever, under such an act, that there would be a flooding of our country with silver. I am satisfied that the people of India and China, constituting nearly half of the people of the world, would continue to purchase silver as the price rises and would not permit it to move into our mints for coinage. Such has been the experience, at least in the past, with regard to the action of the people of China and India. The people of these two countries, when silver was above \$1 an ounce in 1918, 1919, and 1920, bought annually over two thirds of the silver supply. They continued in 1919, when silver reached \$1.38 an ounce, to buy more than their normal amount of silver. If it were necessary to prevent the flow of silver from India and China to the United States mints, the governments of those countries would undoubtedly place an embargo upon the exportation of silver, as they have threatened to do in the past. That is my belief in the matter, but all the proof that I have in support of this opinion is the arguments that I have just used.

I regret to say that an overwhelming majority of the economists in this country do not agree with the position that I take. I do not believe that they are informed with regard to the supply, consumption, and movement of silver. I know that they rarely consider silver from the monetary standpoint. It is by reason of the fear of such economists and those in the East who follow their advice that this country may be flooded with silver that it has been difficult during many years, and is even difficult now, to convince Members of Congress of the safety of a free coinage act at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Congress may or may not at this session enact this legislation. As I have said, I hope they will. If it does, the President's proclamation will do no harm. If it does not, then the President's proclamation will not only be a godsend to the miner but will be of inestimable benefit to everybody in our country through the rise in the world price of silver, the increase of the purchasing power in our country of half of the people of the world who use silver, and the enlarging of our export market.

Now, we, back here, who have been working for years for the restoration of silver, have enough trouble with those who are fearful and ignorant of the problem without having to be harassed by those who should understand the silver problem but who are ignorant of the strategy that is required to educate not only the people of the United States but of the whole world, and thus

ultimately accomplish the full remonetization of silver at its natural ratio to gold throughout the entire world.

It may not be impertinent to call your attention to the fact that I have been constantly and persistently working for the restoration of silver for several years. I offered an amendment to the last tariff act placing a duty of 30 cents an ounce on the importation of silver. I carried this amendment in the Senate, but it was eliminated in the conference committee.

On June 2, 1930, I introduced and passed through the Senate a resolution to investigate the causes of the fall in our export trade to China, knowing at the time that it was due to the fall in the price of silver. I proved this fact, and the report was adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

On February 20, 1931, I introduced in the Senate and passed a resolution requesting the President to call an international conference on silver.

At the London Conference I presented and advocated a silver resolution, as it was agreed upon and approved by the President before I left the United States. The adoption of that resolution by 66 governments at the London Conference resulted in the recognition of silver as money, the abandonment of the practice and policy of melting up silver coins, and the substitution of silver coins for low-valued paper currency. This was the first and the only international money agreement. It had to be carried out by the United States or it would fall. It has been carried out by the President through his proclamation. It has been carried out by India. It will be carried out by the other governments. It was an essential foundation, in my opinion, for the full remonetization of silver.

In my opinion, everyone in the United States, and particularly silver producers, should applaud the President for his initiative, expedition, and firmness in carrying out the plank in the Democratic platform and bringing about the consummation of the London agreement.

With expressions of respect and best wishes for everyone engaged in the mining industry, which has suffered so terribly,

I am, sincerely yours,

KEY PITTMAN.

WALLACE, IDAHO, December 30, 1933.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Wallace Board of Trade, of Wallace, Idaho, is disappointed in the action of the President in authorizing the purchase of domestic silver at 64½ cents per ounce. We believe that fixing the price of silver for a 4-year period, with a rising market for gold, will be of little benefit to anyone and may harm the producers.

If the 50-cent dollar is finally achieved, it will mean that gold will reach a price of \$41.34 per ounce. The silver producer then would receive 64½ cents per ounce in currency depreciated 50 percent and would really be receiving but 32¼ cents measured in gold. In the West the President's action will really result in a lower instead of a higher price for silver. With gold priced at \$34.06 (its present price) per ounce, the 64½ cents per ounce price for silver really means 39¼ cents per ounce, measured in gold.

The average yearly price of silver from 1873—the year silver was demonetized—to 1933, both years inclusive, has been higher than 64½ cents per ounce, for 34 years and lower than that for 27 years.

The only practical and safe monetary policy is more hard money under our crumbling credit structure, and silver is the only suitable metal available. Government purchase of domestic silver at 64½ cents per ounce will not suffice. We must have free silver coinage at a definite ratio to gold to provide stable currency and improve our commercial relations with foreign silver-using people. The monetary record from antiquity to the present time supports remonetization at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Our Government is sufficiently resourceful, influential, and powerful to do so without awaiting action by any foreign power. The common people of this Nation await prompt action in the present crisis to bring on employment and the consumption of commodities.

We therefore urge you to continue the campaign for free coinage of silver at a ratio to gold of 16 to 1.

Very truly yours,

WALLACE BOARD OF TRADE,
By AXEL P. RAMSTEDT, President.

[From the Washington Herald, Dec. 27, 1933]

ROOSEVELT SILVER MOVE IS HAILED AS HIS MOST ASTUTE STEP IN OFFICE—INFLUENCE IN INCREASING VALUE OF STOCKS BY HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS POINTED OUT BY FORBES

By B. C. Forbes

Great is the power of psychology!

At a maximum possible cost to the Government of, say \$5,000,000 in a year, President Roosevelt made a move which immediately increased market values of stocks, commodities, silver, etc., by hundreds of millions of dollars.

In its way, this is most astute, the most diplomatic, the most lucrative step Mr. Roosevelt has made since he entered the White House.

Simply by declaring that the Government will pay 64½ cents an ounce for silver hereafter mined in this country, he so electrified

sentiment that the stock exchange, the commodity exchange, the silver market all instantly marked up quoted values impressively.

The quotation for silver was above 40 cents an ounce before he—in conjunction with other governments—acted. By offering to take some 25,000,000 ounces at approximately a 50-percent increase (representing \$5,000,000), he not only made clamorous silver producers happy, but he convinced others that he is bent on attaining his avowed objective of raising the general-commodity price level, he inspired fresh optimism, and he was instrumental in influencing buyers to swell the quoted value of stocks, commodities, etc., enormously.

For example, the President's announcement, published on Friday morning, boosted the quoted value of the capital stock of the following companies by the amount stated—the day's net gain in price multiplied by the number of shares outstanding.

Company:	Gains
Allied Chemical.....	\$14,400,000
American Can.....	9,896,000
American Smelting.....	10,980,000
Anaconda.....	17,354,000
Cerro De Pasco.....	5,615,000
Chrysler.....	17,480,000
Du Pont.....	54,360,000
General Motors.....	87,000,000
Howe Sound.....	1,984,000
Johns Manville.....	2,250,000
Kennecott.....	20,874,000
Montgomery Ward.....	8,800,000
Pullman.....	11,460,000
St. Joseph Lead.....	3,900,000
Sears Roebuck.....	12,652,000
Timken Roller.....	4,824,000
Union Carbide.....	18,000,000
United States Smelting.....	5,300,000
United States Steel.....	17,406,000

Now we have two sharply different prices for silver just as we have two different prices for gold. The Government, as already told, pays 64½ cents for newly mined silver, against the open-market price of 43½ cents. The Government's quotation for newly mined gold is \$34.06 an ounce, whereas the open-market price is at least \$10 an ounce less.

Abnormalities? Yes. But we are living under abnormal conditions.

Our duty, as loyal citizens, is to exercise to the limit whatever influence we may possess to bring about wise, statesmanlike action by Washington, to criticize when we cannot conscientiously endorse, but to play the game patriotically, constructively under whatever rules are in force.

Persuasion, sure! Sabotage, no!

Happily, President Roosevelt has little occasion to complain that his policies and programs have not been accepted with remarkable grace and supported with unprecedented unanimity. Indeed, no Chief Executive since Washington has ever been accorded such carte blanche or has been so universally upheld by citizens of all political shades.

Continued good luck to him!

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEY PITTMAN AT THE CONFERENCE AT WASHINGTON ON NOVEMBER 17, 1933, CALLED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR THE NATION TO CONSIDER PLANS FOR AN ADEQUATE METALLIC BASE FOR A SOUND CURRENCY

GOLD AND SILVER AS SOUND CURRENCY BASE

I consider the only safe and sound base for international exchange and domestic currency to be gold and silver. The reasons in support of this opinion are:

1. Gold and silver have both been used as money everywhere throughout the civilized world since the dawn of civilization.
2. Gold and silver have all the requisites of money, namely: Resistance against destruction, found in nearly every part of the world; precious metals because they are now and always have been scarce; uniformity of production throughout the ages; uniformity of ratio of production with relation to each other; and fixed habits of people to use both metals as money.

DEFINITIONS OF BIMETALLISM

There are two definitions given to the word "bimetallism." One definition is the use of the two metals, gold and silver, as equal bases for currency issue. The other is the use of both metals for currency issue, but having only one metal as the base and measure of value of the other metal and all currencies.

Under the first mint act of the United States, in 1793, our Government established bimetallism under the first definition; that is, both gold and silver were concurrent bases for currency issue.

ACT OF 1873 MAKES GOLD UNIT OF VALUE IN UNITED STATES

By the act of February 12, 1873, gold alone was established as the unit of value, and the silver dollar was deprived of part of its legal-tender function. Since 1873, our Government has maintained bimetallism under the second definition. It has continued the coinage of subsidiary silver and from time to time has coined standard silver dollars. Each one of our standard silver dollars contains about 0.78 of an ounce of pure silver. Five of such standard silver dollars contain only about 3.9 ounces of silver. Yet without regard to what the world market price of silver may be, the value of the silver in these dollars is maintained at \$1.29

an ounce. That is to say, 5 standard silver dollars, which contain 3.9 ounces of silver, are exchangeable for a \$5 gold note and before we went off the gold standard were exchangeable for a \$5 gold piece.

SILVER PARITY MAINTAINED

This means that the 3.9 ounces of silver in the five silver dollars were valued at \$5, or at the rate of \$1.29 an ounce. This also means that the value of the silver ounce was one sixteenth of the value of the gold ounce. The gold was fixed at \$20.67 an ounce. Silver was fixed at \$1.29 an ounce, which is substantially 16 to 1. The gold dollar contained 22.2 grains of pure gold. The silver dollar contained 371¼ grains of pure silver. This is, again, a ratio by weight of 16 to 1.

RATIO OF SILVER TO TOTAL CIRCULATING CURRENCY

Our Treasury Department is required by law to maintain this parity between our gold currencies and our silver currencies. It has never had any trouble doing it, and yet we have not had an insignificant amount of silver currency; in fact, I think that even our great financiers and some of our noted economists will be surprised to be given the figures. On September 30, 1933, the total circulating currency of the United States was \$5,649,914,116. Of this currency, the total silver currency issue was \$678,390,544. These figures are taken from the report of the United States Treasury under date of September 30, 1933. It will be observed that silver currency is a little over 12 percent of all our currency in circulation.

In 1900 our silver currency was 30 percent of our total currency in circulation. We could increase our silver currency over \$1,500,000,000 before reaching the proportion of silver currency in circulation to the total currency in circulation in 1900.

ACT OF MAY 12, 1933, MAKES SILVER FULL LEGAL TENDER

By the act of May 12, 1933, Congress declared all of our standard silver dollars—in fact, all of our silver currency—full legal tender for all debts, both public and private.

Does it not seem strange that financiers and economists will still look upon silver as nothing but a commodity, like potatoes? Take the other great countries of the world, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany. Do these great countries treat silver only as a commodity? No! All of them have silver coins, such as we have. All of them maintain the parity of such silver coins with their gold currency and other currencies, just as we do, and substantially on the same ratio. There are 13 governments in the world that carry silver as legal reserves against currency issue. Some of these countries have as high as 30 percent of their legal reserves in silver. And this is exclusive of China. China, of course, is exclusively upon a silver monetary base. Holland, for instance, carries a large part of its legal reserve in silver, and under its law reserves to itself the right to redeem its currency in gold or silver, as it sees fit, just as we did prior to 1873, when we demonetized silver. By the act of May 12, 1933, we have authorized the payment of all debts, public and private, in our silver coin.

SILVER THE MONEY OF THE ORIENT

The people of the Orient, who constitute approximately half of all the people of the world, have used silver almost exclusively as money since the beginning of time. Whilst India has been on the pound-sterling basis since 1893, still the money of the hordes of the people of India has been, and still is, silver.

GOLD AND SILVER—RATIO OF PRODUCTION

How is the preciosity of gold and silver determined? By the supply, and by the demand, of course. What has been the supply of silver? According to the report of the Director of the Mint, for the last 400 years the average production of gold and silver has been 14 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. Napoleon fixed the ratio of silver to gold at 15 to 1. England, about the same time, fixed the ratio of silver to gold at 15½ to 1. This, of course, caused silver to flow from Great Britain into France. We first established the ratio of gold and silver at approximately 15 to 1. We subsequently increased the value of the gold dollar, which changed the ratio to about 16 to 1, which it is now. Until 1818 there were no laws discriminating against the use of silver, and silver had its natural value based upon the relative supply of gold and silver and its equal use. In 1818, and at various times since then, laws have been passed by governments reducing the demand for silver by reducing its use as money. The final demonetization legislation against silver in various countries was about 1873, at the same time that our Government went upon the single gold standard of unit of value, and limited the legal-tender character of the standard silver dollar.

SILVER ADJUSTS ITSELF TO NEW STABLE PRICE

Silver adjusted itself to this limited use, and the price of silver throughout the world became quite stable. When our Government and other governments were still coining silver pieces of the approximate weight and value of the standard silver dollar, silver was around \$1 an ounce. When, in 1893, our Government ceased to coin standard silver dollars, silver in the world dropped to around 60 to 65 cents an ounce. There the price remained substantially stable until Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other countries, after the World War, commenced to melt up their silver coins and dump the silver derived therefrom on the markets of the world.

MELTING SILVER COINS WEAKENS PRICE

That again depreciated the price of silver to some extent, but to no great extent, because such unnatural supply of silver was

limited and could be estimated. In 1928, however, the Government of India commenced to melt up the enormous supply of the silver rupee coins of India and dump the silver derived therefrom on the market of the world. This brought about an oversupply of silver, and the price commenced to fall and continued to fall by reason of this continued unnatural oversupply, and by reason of the power of India to sell unlimited quantities of such silver at any time at any price.

MELTING BY INDIA DESTROYS MARKET

The people of India complained bitterly of such governmental action because the reservoir of their wealth was being thereby constantly reduced. The president of the Bank of Issue of India has recently stated that the restoration of the price of silver would do more than anything else for recovery throughout the world.

There is estimated to exist in the world today about \$12,000,000,000 in monetary gold, and about 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver. Most of this silver, of course, is held and hoarded in India and China. That 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver at the price today, in the market of the world, is worth about \$5,160,000,000. If it were given the same value at which our standard silver dollar circulates in this country, namely, \$1.29 an ounce, or one sixteenth of the value of an ounce of gold at \$20.67 an ounce, this 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver would be worth, and have a purchasing power of, \$15,480,000,000. In other words, the purchasing power of the holders of silver money would be increased over 300 percent.

Can any economic sophistry convince any practical person that these people, having nothing but this silver money, would not purchase more from us after such increase in the value of silver than they do now?

LOSS OF AMERICAN AND BRITISH FOREIGN TRADE

Great Britain and the United States have each lost over 75 percent of their trade in manufactured exports to China since the great fall in the price of silver commenced in 1928. Some economists say, "Why, so did the United States and Great Britain lose their export trade all over the world." That is true. But the conditions in China from 1928 to the present time were not the same as they were in the rest of the world. While the rest of the world was suffering a tremendous depression, during that period of time China was enjoying a veritable boom. Well, then, what caused the loss of the trade of Great Britain and the United States in manufactured exports to China? The British economic mission to the Far East states in its report that it was due to the fall in the price of silver and the consequent loss of purchasing power of silver in gold-standard countries, such as the United States and Great Britain, while the Chinese dollar passed at par, its face value, at home.

In 1931, as a representative of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I studied this question in China. I conferred with executive committees of every American and British chamber of commerce in every large city in China. All of the evidence absolutely confirmed the report of the British economic mission to the Far East. When used to purchase products in Great Britain or in the United States, the Chinese dollar has to be exchanged for the money of the United States or the money of Great Britain, and these Governments will not accept it at its face value, but only for the value of the silver in the dollar at the world's market price. As the Chinese dollar has only about 0.78 of an ounce of silver in it, the same as ours, so where silver fell to 25 cents an ounce, we accepted the Chinese dollar as worth only about 19 cents in our money; and when silver was worth 30 cents an ounce in the world market, we accepted the Chinese dollar as worth only about 23 cents. The result was that the Chinese importers had to give 4½ to 5 of his silver dollars for one of ours with which to purchase our merchandise, and therefore they ceased to buy our manufactured articles.

INDIA AND CHINA CEASE BUYING AMERICAN GOODS

Gold flowed into China to buy this cheap silver money with which to buy and to build and enlarge factories. The Chinese are buying more raw cotton from us than ever, but they are not buying very much manufactured cotton goods from us or from Great Britain. They are making their cotton goods at home.

The Chinese used to buy a great number of automobiles from us. They are now buying automobile parts where they can get them cheapest, and assembling and making automobiles in China. At one time they bought as many as 18,000,000,000 cigarettes annually. Now, they are importing only about 1,000,000,000 cigarettes and are manufacturing the rest of them in China.

Our Commerce Department has been reporting to us for the last 2 or 3 years with regard to the great industrialization of China. The British Government for India has forced this on China by destroying the value of silver, and we have not had sense enough to see and understand it.

AGREEMENT AT WORLD CONFERENCE

The World Economic Conference, held recently in London, commenced to realize the situation. Sixty-six governments, by adopting a resolution that I presented on behalf of the United States delegation, treated the silver question from the monetary standpoint. They agreed in that resolution, subject to ratification, to cease the practice of debasing silver coins, to replace low-valued paper currency with silver coins, and to prevent legislation that would deprecate silver on the markets of the world.

India agreed to limit the total sales of silver derived from the melting up of silver coins to 175,000,000 ounces. She further agreed that not to exceed 35,000,000 ounces a year of such silver

would be sold, conditioned on the United States, Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Australia, the countries that are the great producers of silver, absorbing in their treasuries from their mine production an aggregate amount of 35,000,000 ounces of silver for the period of 4 years, commencing on the 1st day of January 1934.

DEMOCRATS FAVOR SILVER REHABILITATION

The President of the United States approved of that silver resolution and approved of the agreement that was reached with India. The Democratic Party in its last platform declared for the rehabilitation of silver. The President of the United States, in his campaign, endorsed that plank and promised to take and maintain the initiative in carrying it out. I have no doubt that he will take the initiative in the restoration of silver. He has under consideration now various plans to accomplish this. One plan that I have submitted to him for his consideration is the opening of the mints of the United States to the coinage of the silver produced in the United States.

AMERICAN COINAGE WOULD NOT FLOOD MARKET

Well, it may be strongly argued, "Why not open the mints to the coinage of the silver of the world?" Personally, I do not believe that much silver would flow to the United States if the mints were thus opened to the silver of the world, because the minute that this great Government, which today is a creditor nation and which today possesses more gold than any other nation in the world, with the greatest amount of natural resources and capacity to produce, should declare its willingness to coin silver from other countries, other governments would, in my opinion, instantly follow the lead and start to coin their silver on their own basis for the purpose of keeping their metallic wealth at home. That is my personal view.

PROTECTION AGAINST FLIGHT OF AMERICAN GOLD

But I cannot blind myself to the fact that great economists and business men in this country hold a contrary view. They are desperately afraid that a large part of the 12,000,000,000 ounces of silver estimated to be in existence would pour into our mints, glut our currency with silver, and cause the flight of gold from our country. Well, of course, there is little danger of the flight of gold from our country because we have clipped its wings, and we do not intend to have it fly away. As a matter of fact, every bit of gold in the world is absolutely essential for the regulation and stabilization of international exchange and the settlement of international trade balances. I think 90 percent of the world's leading economists agree on this fact.

This is another reason why the fear is unfounded that our gold would take flight if we opened our mints to the coinage of silver. But that fear exists, and it exists most strongly in the populous sections of our country, which have the largest representation in the Congress of the United States.

SILVER THE BEST CIRCULATING CURRENCY

If we use gold in the limited manner which is advocated now by the economists, then what is the world to do for domestic currency? It might use paper. What will the paper be based on? You may attempt to measure its value by the gold held in reserve for the settlement of international balances, but you can never expect to have such paper redeemable in gold as in the past. It is more expensive to circulate small paper currency than it is to circulate silver coins. Silver has been proven to be the best circulating currency in the world; and when I say "circulating currency", I do not mean in theoretical circulation but in actual circulation, passing from pocket to till and from till to pocket.

Experience alone will convince the majority of the people of this country that there is not only no danger in the use of silver money, but that its increased use and increased value will be attended by great benefits, not only to our own people but to the people of all the world.

Our President has never had the occasion, nor the opportunity, nor the time, to give to the silver problem the study he would like to have given it; and in this period, when his mind and his body are burdened with problems of such magnitude and complexity as were never before presented to any ruler in the world's history, he must seek and act on the advice of those he considers most competent.

Let us not insist on too much from the President at once. Let us give him a chance to try out by experience the truth of the varying advice of his numerous advisers.

PRODUCTION OF SILVER LIMITED

There can be no danger nor any cause for fear in the coinage of American silver, because the production of that silver is too limited. Our highest production of silver in the United States for any one year was 74,961,075 ounces in 1915. Last year, 1932, the production of silver in the United States was only approximately 24,000,000 ounces. Why this great variation? Because 80 percent of the silver produced in the United States comes as a byproduct in the mining of gold, copper, lead, and zinc. In fact, 55 percent of the silver produced in this country comes as a byproduct in the mining of lead. Until there is great prosperity in the world, or at least in our country, which calls for the great production of lead, copper, and zinc, we cannot expect any substantial increase in the production of silver in the United States.

And this same situation with regard to the production of silver as a byproduct of other metals exists throughout the world. Seventy percent of the world's production of silver comes from the mining of these other metals. Why then should there be a fear of overproduction of silver? The greatest production of silver ever

mined in any one year was 260,970,029 ounces in the year 1929. The world's production of silver for 1932 was only 160,600,000 ounces. Why, even in the years 1918, 1919, and 1920, when silver was above \$1 an ounce throughout the world, and at one time as high as \$1.38 an ounce, when every effort was made throughout the world to discover new silver mines, when old dumps were worked over, when rock pillars left in old silver mines were taken out and worked, when old silver in the form of jewelry, plate, ornaments, and in all other conceivable shape, was gathered up and melted, the production of the world increased only about 25 percent.

I am so convinced that it is a lack of knowledge of the facts with regard to the production and consumption of silver that leads economists and financiers into error that I hope to stimulate a study of these figures that I have briefly quoted from the Director of the Mint.

REMONETIZATION OF SILVER A NATURAL REFLATION OF CURRENCY

There is nothing, in my opinion, that would help our country and, in fact, the rest of the world so much as the remonetization of silver. It would be a sound, safe, and natural reflation of the currency of the world and would, in my opinion, start the purchase of our surplus production by peoples who have been deprived of this opportunity through the unnatural depression in the exchange value of their only money—silver.

Let us get behind the President in the plan to coin silver produced in the United States in the hope and belief that such action will be followed by India, Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Australia. If such is the result, then you will have fixed the ratio of silver to gold throughout the world and will have increased the purchasing power of over half of the people of the world and stabilized not only currencies within governments but the exchange value of such currencies with the currencies of all countries. This would mean world reflation, which is more to be desired than solely domestic reflation, no matter how valuable that may be.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRNES BEFORE NEW ENGLAND SOCIETY OF CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by the Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, junior Senator from South Carolina, at the annual meeting of the New England Society of Charleston, S.C., on December 22, 1933.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I desire to speak to you of the Government of the United States and of its efforts to solve the economic problems confronting us.

The Constitution of the United States sets forth the rights and powers granted to the Government and then specifically reserves to the people all rights not granted. There has never been any doubt about the language of the contract. The only question has been as to the application of that language and of the principles set forth in the contract to specific questions that have arisen during our national existence.

There have been those who sincerely believed the powers of government should be strictly limited to the letter of the law. Others have expressed the view I entertain, that government is not a mere organization composed of a president, members of congress, and those designated by the president to administer the laws; that it is not a mere document, but a living thing into which has been breathed the spirit of the people of a nation; that the people are not creatures of the government; that government is the creature of the people; that it is an instrumentality for the purpose of applying the eternal principle of justice, which is the goal of all men and the fundamental principle of all government.

Men have naturally differed in the application of the principle and in the application of the written words of the Constitution to the changing conditions which during the century and a half of our existence have confronted the people. But whenever government has been confronted by such an issue, the people speaking through the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of this Government, have subordinated the letter of the contract to the spirit of the contract, and caused the Government to serve as an instrument for the protection of the weak against the strong.

In the controversy between the States, resulting in the unfortunate conflict of '61, there is little question that under a strict interpretation of the language of the Constitution, the States of the South were correct in the position they assumed as to the rights of the States. In the armed conflict that ensued, the people of the South, conscious of the accuracy of their interpretation of the Constitution, fighting for the preservation of their homes against an invading army, led by military strategists infinitely superior to those of the opposing army, would have conquered if the majority of the people of this Nation had not concluded that while the South might be correct in its interpretation of the language of the Constitution, that language was invoked for the perpetuation of a system of slavery which was repugnant to the minds and hearts of an overwhelming majority of the people of the Nation, and the letter of the Constitution was subordinated to what was undoubtedly the spirit of a majority of the people of the Nation.

Throughout our history conservatism has been the characteristic of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. This has been particularly true during the last half century, and yet during that period we have seen the commerce clause of the Constitution interpreted to give to the Federal Government jurisdiction over activities which the framers of that document certainly never anticipated would be denied to the governments of the several States. It has been done only because it was essential to progress that government adjust itself to new conditions.

Even though we attribute to statesmen of the early days of the Republic a wisdom greater than they possessed, we know that in the very nature of things they could not have anticipated the changing conditions to which the principles set forth in the Constitution must be applied. They could not anticipate that the oxcart and the covered wagon would be succeeded by the express train, the luxurious automobile, and the wonderful airplane of today. They could not anticipate that the almost impassable roads then supposed to connect the States of the Union would be converted into paved streets. They could not anticipate that communication by post and stage would be succeeded by the air mail, the telegraph, the telephone, and the radio. Who among us will say that the general welfare of the people of America would have been promoted by the narrow and strict construction of courts that would leave the regulation of all these modern means of communication and transportation to the changing whims of the men in the various legislatures of the States, instead of submitting their control and regulation to the Federal Government.

Many of us who believe in the rights of the sovereign States can view with alarm the tendency to surrender voluntarily the powers of the States to the Federal Government, but at the same time we must realize that the very strength of the Nation has been its ability to adjust government to changing conditions as those conditions demanded readjustment. In the early period of our national existence, it was the function of government to secure to the individual who was a pioneer, the right to live his individualistic life. The corporation was unknown. The concentration of wealth was undreamed of. The primary function of government was to protect the individual against interference by government. In recent years our problems have entirely changed. With the advent of the machine age, with the transfer of the power to produce from men to machines, with the development in the factories of New England of machines to plow the plains of Texas and Kansas, there came the investment of capital in corporations, resulting in enormous profits to the incorporators, and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few persons. The problem of the Government was transformed from that of protecting the individual against Government interference to the duty of protecting the individual against the ruthless exercise of power by concentrated wealth. That abuse of power aroused the indignation of men like Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, but the concentration of wealth continued unabated. Even had there not come upon us the economic disaster of 1929 and the years that have succeeded, I believe that government, if it was to function as an instrument for the protection of individual rights, would have been forced to resort to greater regulation of our economic machinery. The individual was fast losing those rights, not by any action of government, but by the inaction of government; not by the power of government, but by the power of concentrated wealth. The disappearance of the corner grocer, the passing of the independent druggist and the independent dry-goods merchant, all testify to a changing order which marked the passing of the individual and the ascendancy of organized business.

Let your minds revert to the days preceding March 4 of this year. It was the thought of those directing the Government that in the solution of the economic problems then overwhelming the people, regardless of the sympathy the Government might have with the plight of the people, that conditions must be allowed to run their course; that as a result of the spree of spending, deflation must continue, commodity prices decrease, and the relief of the hungry and destitute be left with the charitably inclined people of the Nation and with local governments. The reports of the Department of Commerce, as of March 1, 1933, disclosed the fact that unemployment had reached its peak, that bank clearings had decreased in every State and banks were daily closing, that gold was being hoarded and credit facilities denied by banks, that life-insurance companies were in distress and doubt existed as to the value of life-insurance policies. The great railroads of the Nation were facing bankruptcy and Government operation was being urged as the only solution. Mortgages were being foreclosed upon the homes of the people of the cities and of the country. In the great Northwest, as people were driven from their homes, judges were threatened with physical violence. People had lost confidence not only in government but had lost confidence in themselves.

Unrest was not confined to the Northwest but was to be found generally in the great cities of the country. As an evidence of that unrest, when the economy bill of 1932 was under discussion and it was proposed to make a deduction of 10 percent from every check paid by the United States Government except in settlement of a contract, the President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, made to a committee of five Senators, of which I was a member, the request that the cut be not applied to the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy. Though he did not so state, I knew that he must have in mind the fact that when Great Britain, following for a while the same policy of deflation, reduced the

pay of the enlisted men of its Navy, that the sailors of the British fleet, whose loyalty had been the proud boast of Englishmen in all generations, were guilty of mutiny. The President of the United States made the request because of his information as to conditions existing in this country, stating that in the event an emergency arose, he did not want to be forced to rely upon an Army and Navy among whose enlisted men there might be any discontent or dissatisfaction because of reduced compensation. To the request we readily assented.

In other lands the conditions would have been ripe for revolution, but in this Nation, whose people have come from other lands but who have come to love the Constitution of the United States, there was no talk of revolution by any great body of men. The people of America who believed in a change of policy of government sought that change not by force of arms but by the free expression of the will of the people at the ballot box.

The people had no clear conception of the changes they desired. They knew only that they wanted action to succeed inaction; that government had made no effort to solve the economic problems other than the experiment of the Farm Board in the field of agriculture and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the field of business. There was no question of the patriotism of those who were in control of the Government. They simply possessed the untroubling viewpoint that those things in government which had never been done should never be done; that we should rely upon experience and not upon experiment.

Had the pilgrim fathers who landed upon the shores of New England possessed the same viewpoint there would have been no experiment with a new government in a new land. Had the same conservatism dominated America throughout its history, tonight we probably would have lamp light instead of electric light, the oxcart instead of the automobile, and the flying kite instead of the airplane.

Those who came into control of the Government proceeded to obey the mandate of the people. They knew that government could not play the role of spectator while the business structure crumbled; that as government had followed the beaten path and failed to solve our economic problems, government must now blaze a new trail. The Congress delegated to the Chief Executive greater powers than were ever before granted to a President in time of peace. And, be it said to the credit of the Republican Party, that in the crisis confronting the Nation, the representatives of that party in the Congress gave to the measures advocated by a Democratic President just as loyal support as was given by the representatives of the Democratic Party.

The new policies adopted have vitally changed the economic machinery of the Nation. As these changes are made, it is natural that criticism should be aroused. I am not concerned with the criticism of the professional politician nor the selfish individual who dislikes to see lessened the purchasing power of his accumulated dollars. I am concerned with the criticism of the patriotic citizen who entertains sincere doubt as to the necessity for and wisdom of these changes. He has a right to doubt, and a right to inquire. These changes in policy are made by a majority. I do not believe in the divine right of kings, nor do I believe in the divine right of majorities. Those who constitute the majority should willingly explain to the minority the justification for their acts.

Let me say that in what has been done, the Government has had three general purposes: First, to protect property rights; second, to restore the purchasing power of the people by providing jobs for the unemployed and increasing the wages of those who are employed; and, third, to raise commodity prices to such an extent that those who have borrowed money will, on the average, be able to repay that money in the same kind of dollar which they borrowed.

We can agree that no property is of greater importance than the savings of the people. Savings represent not only toil and sacrifice but represent the hope for protection in old age and protection for dependents. For years little was done by government to protect the property which had been deposited in the banks of the Nation. Then 4 years ago the great "parade" started. Within 4 years 4,000 banks closed, and on March 4 the remaining institutions closed. In order to protect the property of the people, the Government has now legislated to regulate banking, to force the great national banks to divorce themselves from the corporations they organized for the purpose of doing through these corporations that which national banks, under the law, could not do. As a result, national banks of the great cities can no longer invite deposits from the so-called "country" banks and lend those funds to affiliated corporations so that such corporations can invest the funds in the purchase of doubtful domestic securities and worthless foreign securities.

Government has interfered to stop the payment of interest upon demand deposits. This practice resulted in competing for deposits and the payment of rates of interest which was made possible only by banks engaging in speculative transactions.

The Government has interfered to establish an insurance fund, one third to come from the Treasury, one third from the profits of the Federal Reserve banks, and one third from assessments upon the deposits of the local banks. The Association of Reserve Banks, in opposing this policy, argues, plausibly, that the remedy for the evil lies not in the guaranteeing of deposits but in amending the banking laws so as to insure sound banking. All men agree that if the banking laws can be amended so as to insure sound banking they should be immediately so amended. If the bankers will suggest the amendments that will have this beneficial result, I am

sure that the Congress will adopt the amendments, even though they may regret that the secret of sound banking has been so long withheld.

If these gentlemen are correct, there will be no harm in retaining the insurance of deposits, because if by reason of their amendments sound banking results, no losses will be incurred by the banks and no loss will result from the guaranteeing of deposits. At the same time it will give security to depositors, bring into the banks money now hoarded, and give relief to stockholders who have been living in fear of the stockholders' liability to depositors.

The Public Works Administration, with its loans for the construction of public-works projects in order to provide jobs for the unemployed, is criticized as a willful waste of public funds. It is waste only if the money is not to be repaid. I know that even in South Carolina some men of prominence have been advising the people that the probability was that they would not be called upon to repay funds borrowed for the construction of these projects. I have never borrowed money with the intention of not repaying it, and I do not want my municipality, county, or State to do that which I as an individual would be unwilling to do. The money used in these projects is borrowed by the Treasury of the United States. If those who now borrow the money fail to repay it, then when the obligations of the Government mature those obligations must be paid by taxing the people. Those taxes will be paid not only by those who live in the cities where the stadiums and swimming pools are constructed but by those who live in the small towns where no projects are constructed and by the farmers of the Nation who will never see the projects. It may be true that some men in public life will seek to cancel these obligations, but I have enough confidence in the honesty of the people of the Nation to believe that payment will be insisted upon, and certainly I can say that if prior to January 1937 such cancellation is sought, even if it be advocated by every municipality in South Carolina that is today borrowing money, my vote will be cast to require those who borrow this money to repay it to the Government of the United States.

In the effort to restore the purchasing power of the farmers of the Nation it was necessary not only to increase consumption but to curtail production. In order to do this, processing taxes were levied to secure funds with which to compensate the farmers for the abandonment of acreage. It is argued that this tax is an unjust levy upon consumers and amounts to a subsidy to the farmers. It does involve practically the same principle as the levying of protective-tariff duties. For years the manufacturers have demanded that protective-tariff duties be levied in order to enable them to collect from the farmers and other people of the Nation a higher price for their products. The levying of such tariff duties was called "statesmanship", but when the same principle is temporarily resorted to in an effort to restore the purchasing power of the farmers of the Nation it is demagoguery, and it is dangerous.

It is urged that loans to refinance mortgages and loans for construction projects made in the hope of restoring the purchasing power of the people constitute an abuse of the powers of government and are an unwarranted use of public funds and of public credit. This charge, however, is generally made by the men who in 1932 urged the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By reason of the loans that are made today to municipalities and to the home owners of the Nation we may incur some losses, but I venture to say that the loss will be infinitesimal as compared with the losses resulting from the loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the railroads, banks, and insurance companies.

Before we condemn the Public Works Administration and the Civil Works Administration we should determine what is the alternative to these policies. We cannot increase the price level of agricultural commodities and then do nothing to put back to work the unemployed people of the cities, whose purchasing power must be restored in order to consume the products of the farm. It is better to provide work than to follow the English in resorting to the dole with its evil effects upon the beneficiaries.

Critics even extend their criticism to the efforts of the Government to relieve the suffering and the destitute. The Federal Government did not enter this field until the sovereign States of the Union, through their chief executives, certified that charitable organization and local governments had exhausted their funds and urged that the Federal Government alone had the credit facilities to secure the funds necessary to aid the needy. It is charged that some of the money is wasted. That is true of every fund that is spent for a charitable purpose. Even if it be true that as much as one third of it should be wasted, if the other two thirds shall serve to save human lives and prevent human suffering, the expenditure is justified, for the United States Government, with its wealth and its credit, can never sit idly by while its people suffer and starve.

Still another effort has been made by the Government to solve our problems by the operation of the National Recovery Administration. Inevitably it involves an interference with the ordinary business activities of the individual. It further necessitates action through groups instead of through the individual. I cannot now discuss its operation or its success. I call attention simply to the fact that it is not the first time the Government has so interfered, and it has usually interfered at the behest of business and for the profit of business.

It was at the request of the railway executives that the Esch-Cummings Act contains a provision that before any railroad which is to engage in interstate commerce can be constructed there must be secured a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

In order to protect existing railroads against the destructive competition due to overzealous promoters, they asked that Government deny to an individual who has money with which to build a railroad the right to build unless it can be shown that it is necessary in order to serve the public.

If the payment of a pittance to farmers in order to curtail production is a subsidy and is communistic, then why is it not equally communistic for Government to pay subsidies to some corporations in order to promote the construction and development of the merchant marine? Why is it not communistic to pay subsidies to aviation corporations under the guise of mail contracts?

I suppose that no effort of the Government in this emergency has aroused more criticism than the effort to raise the price of commodities by reducing the gold content of the dollar. Forceful articles have been written as to the evils of inflating the currency by printing unlimited greenbacks. However, no one has yet pointed out where any administrative official of government has ever shown a desire or an intention to do that of which they complain. We are reminded of the uncontrolled inflation by the French Government more than a century ago, and by the German Government in the days succeeding the World War. We are never told that the President has no power to order the printing of Treasury notes except the power which is given to him in the Thomas amendment. That amendment authorizes the issuance of Treasury notes, but limits the amount of such notes to \$3,000,000,000 and provides they can be used solely for the redemption of outstanding obligations of the Government. It authorizes nothing but the substitution of a non-interest-bearing demand obligation for an interest-bearing time obligation of the Government. And there has been absolutely no indication by the President that he intends to exercise even this limited power.

The President has said, however, that it is his intention to have government do all in its power to raise the price level of commodities to a point where the borrowers in America can pay their debts with dollars having on an average the same value as the dollars they borrowed. In the prosperous days preceding 1929 there was a substantial adjustment of the price level of commodities to the level of taxes and debts. Since that time taxes have not been lowered, debts have not been decreased, but the value of commodities was decreased from 75 to 80 percent. It is manifest that there can be no return of normal conditions until there is an adjustment of this relationship. Either debts and taxes must be reduced to substantially the price level of commodities or the price level of commodities must be increased substantially to the relation which existed between such commodities and debts and taxes prior to 1929.

You are in favor of either inflation or deflation. The only escape from this alternative is for you to say that you favor stabilization. If you favor stabilization, you admit your approval of the increase in the price level resulting in great measure from the inflation and threats of inflation during the last few months. If you are not in favor either of inflation or of stabilization at present prices, then you must be in favor of deflation, and there are few who are willing to admit that they favor a return to deflation with all its suffering and all its tragedies. Great Britain attempted deflation but abandoned it. France is now attempting it but will be forced to abandon it.

No person in authority has contended that by increasing the price of gold in the markets of the world there would immediately follow a corresponding increase in the price level of commodities. It is contended that such an increase will gradually follow. That theory is now being given a fair test, but it is being done in a conservative way. Some critics declare it matters not at what price the dollar is stabilized, provided it is immediately stabilized. Great Britain has been off the gold standard for more than 15 months and its pound sterling has fluctuated daily. Great Britain has prospered and its credit is not impaired. When it comes to determining the price at which the dollar shall be stabilized, I am unwilling to have that question determined either by the radical inflationist or the selfish deflationist. I am willing to leave it to the man in the White House who listens to representatives of both views, who for years has made a study of the subject and whose mind and heart are devoted solely to the best interests of the American people.

And the comfort of the people is that in the Congress of the United States there are a sufficient number of men, members of both of the great political parties, who realize the seriousness of the problem, and who will support the President in his efforts to determine this question in an orderly way, granting relief to the debtors of the Nation, but at the same time protecting the credit of the Government and preserving the soundness of the dollar.

Whether these experiments in government will completely solve our economic problems, no man can say. We can only say that progress is being made. Millions of men have been given employment. Improvement is evident in the increased car-loadings and increased production of steel, coal, and of automobiles. I do not believe that there is a single business enterprise whose gross income is not in excess of the corresponding months of 1932. Cotton is selling for 10 cents instead of 5 cents per pound. Wheat is selling for 80 cents instead of 30 cents per bushel. Homes in the cities and upon farms are being refinanced and, most important of all, hope has supplanted despair in the hearts of the people.

There are those who admit this progress, but say that the policies by which it is accomplished are revolutionary and threaten to alter our form of government. These policies may somewhat

alter the form of our Government, but will not alter the spirit of our Government. They may be idealistic, but they are not revolutionary. And at this time we may be fortunate to have a little idealism in government. I am satisfied that the story of corruption and of tax evasion by the financial leaders of the Nation, who have for years been held up to the people as the exemplars of business integrity, has done more to destroy confidence of the people in the leadership of the Nation and has done more to injure our Government, than all of the new policies inaugurated by the Government for the relief of the people.

Whether you believe these policies to be idealistic or revolutionary, you have the knowledge that most of them are authorized by Congress only for the period of the emergency. When the emergency passes, they must pass. For permanent prosperity, all thoughtful men know, we must rely upon private enterprise, with only such government regulation as is essential for the protection of individual rights. The people have given whole-hearted support to such policies as the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, because they know that in order to accomplish any recovery it is essential to curtail production in field and in factory. They know that this cannot be done by individual effort—that it must be done by government. But when these measures have brought about an adjustment of production to consumption, the very people who have been most urgent in their demands for government regulation, will be most urgent in demanding that government cease its regulation of business, and the people of the United States have the happy assurance that their Government will respond to the will of the people.

THE CASE FOR BIMETALLISM—ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the former Senator from Colorado, Hon. Charles S. Thomas. The article is entitled "The Case for Bimetallism", and is a comprehensive and able discussion of what is commonly called the "silver question."

Senator Thomas is known throughout the United States as one of the ablest statesmen of his day. He was Governor of his State and served with distinction in the Senate of the United States. Senator Thomas has been one of the ablest champions of sound money, of genuine bimetallism, and no man has given more profound thought to financial problems than he, and no man living knows as much about the cause of bimetallism as does Senator Thomas. His article is an able discussion of a vital question, one which demands attention at the hands of Congress and calls for immediate and favorable action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR BIMETALLISM

Jefferson and Hamilton, representing two schools of political philosophy, dominated the political development of the Nation from its commencement. They were antagonists, always, yet in cordial agreement with the structure and design of our monetary policy, which was not surprising; for there was little ground in their day for discord. Mr. Jefferson constructed the legislative framework and the report upon which he submitted to Mr. Hamilton's judgment. Its basis was bimetallic, and in accord with the world's monetary history from, if not before, the beginning of civilization. It was the simple expression of natural and necessary conditions. Gold and silver, always in physical association with each other, were mutually precious in human estimation, and therefore, selected as standards of value for all other commodities ministering to human comfort and necessities. Indeed, as time progressed, it became more and more obvious that, with their increasing abundance, they were of little value for anything, except as media of exchange, and for limited ornamental and decorative purposes. Moreover, they were too soft and pliable to admit of their substitution for the baser metals, whose intrinsic nature and unlimited quantity better served the requirements of man. Of the two precious metals, silver was more abundant in quantity, and, therefore, the less highly prized; but the demand for both as money was constant and commensurate with the supply, when their quantity in ratios was fixed and adhered to.

This ratio was not haphazard. In the course of time, man observed that the natural law of production of gold and silver yielded the two metals in a constant and practically unvarying proportion of approximately 14 parts of silver to 1 part of gold. Hence, the establishment of the equivalent of that ratio for measurement of their value in exchange became not only convenient, but essential to the establishment of an unchanging measure or standard of other commodities; hence, Mr. Jefferson, originally inclined to silver as the basis, because less liable to fluctuation, easily adopted the view of Hamilton, who asserted that "to annul the use of either metal is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation."

"Let the standard", added Jefferson, "rest upon both metals." The ratio was fixed at 15½ parts of silver to 1 of gold by weight.

This system, so carefully devised and launched upon the infant Nation in 1792, functioned perfectly until 1836, when the ratio was altered from 15½ parts of silver to 1 of gold to 16 to 1 by the law of that year as to silver dollars, the weight of all fractional silver coins remaining as before.

The use of any other than the bimetallic system of money under our Constitution or the exclusion of one of them for the other, or at all, probably never occurred to anyone prior to the draft of the act of 1873 as within the legislative power of Congress. James G. Blaine, in 1876, asserted that Congress had no more power to demonetize either one of the metals than it had to demonetize both.

Daniel Webster emphasized the same contention years before by declaring that "I am certainly of the opinion that gold and silver at the rates fixed by Congress constitute the legal standard of value, and that neither Congress nor any State has the authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard." What intelligent and unprejudiced man can place any other construction upon the constitutional inhibition that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts"? Not one but both.

The yield of our silver mines was, until the latter half of the nineteenth century, not remarkable, while from 1849 gold in enormous quantities from the new land of California profoundly influenced the country's social and economic expansion. It did not, however, effect any change in the structure of our money system until the passage of the Coinage Act of February 15, 1873, when the law of 1792 was radically changed by the demonetization of silver, although the silver dollar was retained as the national standard of value until 1900, when the gold dollar of 8.25 grains was substituted for it.

The act of 1873 was inspired by the owners of the National Securities, the outgrowth of the American Civil War of 1861-65. This debt, beginning in 1861 and increased by succeeding issues, reached, in 1866, the enormous aggregate of \$2,775,763,929, and drawing annual interest at differing rates until refunded. Subsequent legislation affecting these bonds always enhanced their values in terms of gold, and, of course, at the expense of other forms of property.

Legislation in the interest of the public creditor, from 1865 to 1873, therefore contracted the medium of payments, first from paper to coin, and then to gold, easily doubled the burden of the debt during the decade of 1875-85, and at the same time shrunk the national monetary circulation by half its volume. Silver was deprived of its legal tender function save as to individual payments not exceeding \$5 at one time, while contracts involving time payments were authorized to be paid in gold only. This effectually closed the door to the remonetization of silver. It was thereafter possible only by political revolution, which has been coming on outspread wings since 1929. It is a bold man who, familiar with the course of these events, would deny that they have constantly aggravated the financial difficulties of the world, developed chaotic and constantly expanding economic disasters everywhere, and bound to culminate in world bankruptcy, unless prevented by radical and far-reaching monetary and economic changes and policies in all public and private commercial affairs. It is the story often repeated of greed, dishonesty, and disaster, of the robbery of the people's substance for the enrichment of the public creditor.

We first hear of a single, or gold standard of money in 1816. It came with the act of parliament of that year demonetizing silver, and making all liabilities, public and private, of the British Empire payable in gold or its equivalent, measured by the fineness of the English pound sterling, as then coined. The victory of Wellington over Napoleon in 1815 automatically and enormously enhanced the market value of the British consols. The House of Rothschild, then the owner of a preponderant amount of these obligations, inspired the promotion and enactment of the gold act of 1816, designed for, and resulting in, colossal profit to that great banking house and other public creditors, which will recall the terrible suffering and misery of that generation of Englishmen, coming with the inevitable resulting panic so vividly recorded by Mr. Archibald Alison, the English historian. Here, let me say, in passing, that every enactment of history, whether in Europe or America, tending to disturb or overthrow the old bimetallic financial system, on the one hand, and exalting the gold system on the other, has been inevitably followed by a long-continued and heart-breaking season of panic, bankruptcy, failures, shrinkage of circulation, confiscation of all forms of property, indeed by the whole train of economic disasters consequent upon these deliberate interferences with the general progress of nations.

Just here, a brief review of our national debt legislation is essential. The first issue of our bonded indebtedness was made payable in "lawful money." The only money available was the greenback, then passing at par. Gold and silver, true to their instincts, fled the continent at the first note of danger, the paper dollar rapidly depreciated, finally reaching the low rate of 38 cents in specie. The great bulk of Government Civil War bonds were bought around 50 cents to the dollar, and, therefore, at one half their face value. With the end of the war came both peace and a rise in the Government security market, swiftly followed by clamor for payment at par in coin of the realm. The great majority of the country, under the leadership of Thaddeus Stev-

ens, demanded payment to the creditor in the money with which he purchased his bonds, but, of course, at par. This was bitterly and successfully resisted; the contest culminated in the Act of 1869, ironically entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit", which enacted the redemption of the public debt in coin of the existing weight and fineness of official coins of the United States. This law, ostensibly, settled the dispute in favor of the creditor and to his immense advantage. Notwithstanding his victory, a brief 4 years afterward the Coinage Act of 1873 was passed and approved. Its full import and purpose were not realized until long after it had received the President's signature. When its character was revealed, an exasperated Nation was confronted by the fact that the bimetallic system of money had been quietly destroyed over night—that only gold was legal tender and payable in the discharge of all public and private liabilities. Meantime, the country had passed into the grasp of the awful panic of September 1873, which continued for the next 6 years, accompanied and followed by the inevitable consequences of misery and ruin in all their phases.

In the immediate reaction, our leading statesmen staged a vociferous chorus of ignorance and innocence. The President of the United States, unaware that he had approved the bill 11 months before, wrote to his friend, Cowdry, on October 3, 1873: "I wonder why silver is not already coming into the market to supply the deficiency in the circulating medium—silver will gradually take the place of currency, and, further, will become the standard of values, which will be hoarded in a small way." James G. Blaine, James A. Garfield, and a host of lesser personages, sadly confessed their ignorance of the contents of the law that they had unwittingly enacted. Yet, from that day to this, the Act of 1873 has remained on the statute books. The veto of the Remonetization Act of 1878 by President Hayes still stands, albeit the great majority of that generation and of every succeeding one has favored the return to the law of Jefferson and Hamilton.

In 1878 and again in 1890, Congress, over the protests of bimetalism, changed our monetary system by substituting compulsory for free coinage of silver. Whatever their object, the result reduced silver to a mere market commodity, carrying the burden of a constantly diminishing commercial value until in 1896 it was finally condemned and degraded to a cheap and despised mass of junk. Outside of the United States it became, and has remained, the outcast of the economic world. Since 1873 all obligations are payable in gold or its equivalent, albeit the standard has been abandoned and denied contact with the mass of mankind.

During this long interval nation after nation has perforce accepted gold as a measure of all things material, especially national obligations, whether issued by silver or gold standard countries. Yet we have confronted ever since 1816 the obvious truth that silver is the money medium of all peoples, whatever their nationalities or destiny; it circulates, performs, along and does the financial work of three fourths of the globe. Its purchasing power has fallen from par at 16 and 15½ to 1 down to the merest fraction of the ratio. It functions because nothing else can function. Its resurrection and vindication can neither be avoided nor much longer be postponed. Yet the public creditor, the politician, whatever his calling, the national political organizations, however otherwise divided, many of the world's leading economists, the financial thinker, even the apostles of the "brain trust" persist in their persistent and unvarying worship of the golden calf of modern finance.

And I deliberately charge that ever since the act of 1873 was ignorantly approved by a well-meaning President their influence has been continually enlisted in a crusade of gold monometallism, that every statute designed for the public well-being, or at all affecting that standard, has either been disregarded, misconstrued, or misinterpreted and then made to defeat its ends in the interest of the system.

Beginning with Secretary Sherman in 1877, and continuing with Woodin, just retired, every Secretary of the Treasury, every assistant, every deputy, every Comptroller of the Currency, every member of the Federal Reserve Board, of the new Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and of the other financial organizations of the day, has been a militant opponent of bimetalism. There may be, somewhere along the line, some freak who is an exception, but if so, the fact itself is lost to the records of history.

From the day of silver's demonetization down to this hour, silver coinage has been identified by its opponents with currency inflation. The charges have long been coequivalent. Republicans of 1896 hurled the slander at every man and woman opposing McKinley, and have echoed it ever since. Yet, no more unfounded and malignant falsehood was ever devised against an honest citizenry. You may say anything else against bimetalism except that. Indeed, bimetalism is the one absolute and implacable foe of inflation in the monetary world. The charge was never thought of, much less pronounced, before the days of the gold standard. There is only so much silver and so much gold on earth. They can only increase through production, and the law of their relative expansion is an unchangeable fact of nature. Were every ounce of silver coined by the mints, it would only result in more basic circulation. The bullion would simply be transmuted into coin. It would be like manna to a starving world.

The world's stock of silver was officially stated at 10,013,341,290 fine ounces down to 1931. Were this aggregate sum available for mintage, it would, at \$1.29 the ounce, realize \$12,915,819,264; calculating the world's population at 1,500,000,000, the per capita distribution of this amount of coin would give every individual only

\$8.60. The total sum of silver available for added mintage is, of course, a mere fraction of the world's stock, the far greater proportion of which has long been in circulation.

An old student of money a century ago happily defined the bimetallic system as reciprocal. Any redundancy of either metal adjusted itself automatically. He compared the movement of the circulation to two reservoirs communicating with each other by underground pipes, so that the leakage or outflow of either would automatically cause the inflow of the other until the equilibrium of both was restored. Too much gold in France would draw her surplus to England, and vice versa. This interchange, though unconscious in operation, would be effective and would cease with the need for its continuance. Such was the operation of the system until the gold laws of Great Britain dislocated and wrecked it.

Yet with bimetalism as an accomplished fact there would be no longer need for added coinage, except as required by commerce for the small aggregate of expanding fractional exchanges throughout the world; a metallic currency, except as a basis for the system, is not even desirable, for the consequent abrasion is too expensive. Paper equivalents, passing at par, are too general and too convenient, to say nothing of bank checks, to be diminished or discarded. Those who clamor for the actual coinage of silver do not realize how needless coinage machinery has become to the modern world. Governments quit coining gold years ago. Buyers prefer uncoined bars for use in settlements; even these are becoming superfluous, and silver bullion performs the same office with increasing frequency the world over.

Were we to rely upon party declarations, we may assert that both Republican and Democratic platforms mutually reaffirm the old doctrine of bimetalism as campaigns wax and wane. Mr. McKinley was its outspoken advocate up to 1896, and his party then unequivocally reaffirmed it as an international policy, to the accomplishment of which it solemnly pledged itself. Not only so, but the statute of 1900, still in force, expressly committed the Government to its attainment. Moreover, Congress, on March 3, 1897, enacted a law providing that "whenever the President shall determine that the United States shall be represented at any international conference called by any country with a view to securing, by international agreement, a fixity of relative value between gold and silver as money, by means of a common ratio between these metals, with their mintage at such ratio, he may appoint five or more commissioners to such international conference."

One hundred thousand dollars was appropriated by this act for the payment of the joint expenses thereof, including compensation to the commissioners. Pursuant to this law the President immediately appointed Vice President Stevenson and Senator Wolcott, of Colorado, as commissioners to effectuate its object. France expressed approval, but Britain declined, whereupon Gage, the Secretary of the Treasury, refused to proceed, and the President acquiescing, it was abandoned. The law is, nevertheless, still effective and the appropriations as well.

The presidential silver campaign of 1896 was easily the most venomous political contest in history. It teemed throughout with invective, falsehood, and unrestrained abuse. The Republican press went to the limit. Bryan was cartooned, vilified, denounced, ridiculed, belittled, and misrepresented from the hour of his nomination to the closing of the polls in November. He became the outstanding liar, lunatic, traitor, scoundrel, and enemy of all mankind. The commercial, industrial, and financial interests spared neither money nor effort to accomplish his defeat. As against him, corruption and violation of laws were translated into terms of justice, truth, and patriotism. It may be said, in retrospect, that Mr. McKinley's triumph was accomplished by the greatest monetary expenditure ever made for the debauchment of the franchise in any country pretending to function under the principle of representative government. Yet, Mr. Bryan only contended for a return to the ancient monetary policy of the country. He opposed both the debasement and the inflation of the Nation's money. No novel, experimental, false, or fantastic charge was made against him or his party; yet to this hour he has been identified with all that is wrong, dangerous, extreme, undesirable, menacing, and immoral in politics, ethics, and economics. His aggressive adherence to the fundamental institutions of this Government became his unforgivable and unforgettable offense. But, if it be true that time is the inexorable test of truth, it is safe to predict this man's ultimate vindication.

Efforts to establish gold as the sole and universal standard of value have constantly and uniformly failed. It is against the inexorable logic of nature and experience. As early as 1871, Ernest Seyd, one of the greatest economists in history, said:

"It is a great mistake to suppose that the deflation of the gold values, besides England, will be beneficial. It would only lead to the destruction of the monetary equilibrium hitherto existing, and a decline in prosperity all over the world."

This I consider the greatest and profoundest forecast of history.

A brief reference to the fiscal history of India during the last 40 years is sufficient to demonstrate the fact. A great country, long subject to foreign domination, has proven immune to laws designed to transform its monetary system, by the mandate of Britain. In 1897 the Indian mints were closed over night, to the further coinage of silver. The market value of silver bullion shrank within 48 hours to one half of its previous price, producing the consequent universal disasters of panic and bankruptcy. Mr. Cleveland demanded, and was granted, immediate cessation of coinage here, and England, by act of Parliament promptly decreed the extension of the gold standard over India

in 1900. Yet, the rupee persisted in its circulation, British obstinacy notwithstanding. Four hundred and forty-five million pounds sterling were sunk for all time in India, in the determination to accomplish the impossible. When the project was transiently abandoned in 1925, Britain, still unconvinced, then created its Indian Currency Commission, which in 1926, recommended a so-called "gold-bullion standard", fantastic in design, and impossible in practice. It also decreed the destruction of the rupee and the dumping of its resultant bullion on the world's markets. Here, too, it confronted certain failure. Its paper substitutes for the rupee have been rejected in toto by the people. Meanwhile, Britain herself has been compelled to abandon its darling standard, it is to be hoped, for all time. Her example has, perforce, been imitated by virtually the rest of the single-standard world.

The persistence of silver as a measure of values has accompanied every world movement designed for the stimulation of exchanges and extension of the world's purchasing power. Again and again mankind has resorted to its increasing use, in spite of bitter opposition, under the increasing pressure of public opinion. The tremendous shrinkage of legal-tender money consequent upon the enormous and unceasing and expanding demands for it, automatically advanced the market value of silver bullion from the close of the World War, in the summer of 1919, from 60 cents to \$1.40 per ounce in gold. It was the highest price in recorded history, exceeding the ratio value of 16 to 1 by 11 cents per ounce.

By every contention of economic thought we were then on the road to universal inflation, yet none of its assumed consequences became apparent.

On the contrary, bimetallism had become automatic, and the problem of gold and silver money was solved, happily, and apparently for the indefinite future, and it would have been so but for the chronic and destructive interference of the Federal Treasury in the interest of the gold standard.

The story is a sordid and disgraceful one: An assault by the Treasury Department upon its own Government, against the integrity of its own silver money, through the agency of three international banks. Briefly, on November 14, 1919, the Vice Governor of the Federal Reserve Board suggested to the Assistant Secretary that the Department should "prohibit the export of standard dollars while making it plain that no prohibition exists against the export of bullion obtained by melting them."

Hence 29,000,000 silver dollars were sold to the exporters by the Treasury, which were melted at Shanghai and dumped on the markets to "regulate our exchanges with countries having a silver money standard." In May these exchanges had been so thoroughly regulated that silver bullion had been pegged down from \$1.38 to 60 cents per ounce. This gigantic conspiracy of injustice was not only without warrant of law but in defiance of it. This time it avoided the menace of silver inflation and was unconscious of its presence. I am entirely within bounds when I assert that the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the Asia Banking Corporation, its two banking associates, and all its fellow conspirators deliberately violated the laws of their country, to its permanent loss and injury. Instead of punishment they were awarded complete immunity. The whole history of Treasury administration since 1873 is a sinister and humiliating crusade of authority against the fiscal code, for the protection and ultimate establishment of the gold standard. How long will the American people endure or condone this policy of persistent lawlessness?

And the gold standard, where is it? What peoples longer do it reverence? What has become of it? Why does it now shun the habitations of man? Why has the possession of gold become a felony in the eyes of the law? Why is France pale with terror and the nation facing ruin, although her vaults bulge with the greatest per capita accumulation of it in history? Nothing but its ghost remains. Gold itself has disappeared. It has long been too precious for human contact and too sacred for human needs. Nations fight for any available grains of it, while its so-called "market value" has reached fantastic dimensions. Measured in terms of price, it is, as ever, the most expensive and baleful and the most unattainable thing in the universe.

The man who still dreams of its restoration as the world's measure of values, however sincerely, is unfit to administer the fiscal affairs of the most obscure of nations. For he does not, because he will not, realize that between bimetallism and paper inflation the world no longer has any alternative. It must appeal to the one, or the other will overwhelm it.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

As in executive session,

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I understood that there was a resolution adopted a few moments ago, while I was engaged in committee, referring all nominations to the appropriate committees. Am I right as to that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the resolution to provide that in case there shall not be an executive session on any calendar day, it will be the duty of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to refer all nominations to the appropriate committees. The Chair will read the resolution, if the Senator desires.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, unquestionably that is both the purpose and effect of the resolution.

All nominations received today will automatically go to the appropriate committees unless there is objection.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that I may report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nomination of Henry Morgenthau to be Secretary of the Treasury. I may say in that connection that the nomination will go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, heretofore I have expressed my disapproval of such practice. I think every nomination, however important the position involved may be, should follow the rule and go to the appropriate committee and be reported back. There may be some objection to Mr. Morgenthau. There has been some objection expressed here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. McNARY. I will listen to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The custom has been to confirm the nominations of Cabinet members without reference to committees unless a special request was made that a particular nomination should go to the appropriate committee. The resolution which has been agreed to merely provides for the reference to committees of all nominations.

Mr. McNARY. I was just reciting, as a general observation, that last year the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Oregon agreed upon a plan whereby all nominations would go to the appropriate committees. Here is an individual nomination, standing by itself, against which I have heard complaint made upon the floor of the Senate. I have no objection to the nomination, but I am trying to protect those who are not prepared at this time to state their position. Why should there be such haste? Why not let the nomination take the usual course?

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that, in this instance, the nomination is that of a Cabinet officer—

Mr. McNARY. I understand that—

Mr. HARRISON. And some of us have thought that the President of the United States was entitled to have the members of his own official family appointed and confirmed quickly; but I am not making the request that the nomination be now considered by the Senate. The Committee on Finance this morning met with a very full attendance—I think there were only two members absent—and they unanimously directed me to report the nomination favorably to the Senate. It will go on the calendar. I shall not insist upon taking it up today.

Mr. McNARY. I do not object to the Senator reporting the nomination for the calendar. I thought he was asking for its consideration at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not make that request.

Mr. McNARY. I make no objection to the nomination being reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the nomination will go to the calendar.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as a matter of personal privilege, by reason of some publicity that has been given to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgenthau as Secretary of the Treasury I want to make a brief statement.

There were handed to me several newspaper reports containing some statements Mr. Morgenthau has made with regard to settlements pending in the Internal Revenue Bureau which, as I understand the law, were irregular and I think more or less unwise. Some other matters were included in the statements handed to me. While the examination of Mr. Morgenthau was in executive session I think I may say that Mr. Morgenthau admitted having made the statements.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the statements were made in executive session why should the Senator disclose them?

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator will not object to the disclosure.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am objecting, though. I was in the executive session with the Senator and heard the state-

ments, and I am objecting to their disclosure. The Senator should not rise on the floor of the Senate and disclose what took place in executive session.

Mr. LONG. Very well. I will get at it in this way without stating that it was in executive session. Mr. Morgenthau does not deny having made the statements. There is some disagreement among Senators as to whether or not what he did is, technically speaking, a violation of the terms of the statute. Personally I think it is irregular, but none the less the disclosures that Mr. Morgenthau made in the papers and such contact as I have had with the gentleman since that time convince me that the irregularities were with intent to favor the public rather than to do it injury, so I am not making any objection to confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Louisiana is not going to make objection to confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgenthau. May I say with reference to one remark the Senator made that there may be some difference of opinion among members of the committee as to whether or not Mr. Morgenthau violated any law in making certain statements. I cannot permit that statement to pass unnoticed, because I think there was not very much difference of opinion among the members of the committee with reference to that point. I believe I have never seen any man appear before a committee who made a finer impression on the membership of the committee than did the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau. The vote was unanimous in favor of his confirmation.

Mr. LONG. Permit me to make just this further statement. I do not say the gentleman particularly violated the law. I think at least what the Secretary of the Treasury did was outside the law. If I myself had been a member of the committee I would not have opposed the confirmation. I think the statements he made were very unwise. All of us young men live to learn, and I think the Secretary of the Treasury will profit by this experience and probably will not do such a thing again.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD B. ALMON, OF ALABAMA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions (H.J.Res. 203), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. EDWARD B. ALMON, a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I send resolutions to the desk and ask for unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The resolutions (S.Res. 114) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 114

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EDWARD B. ALMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES S. PARKER, OF NEW YORK

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate House Resolution 204, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (H.Res. 204), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES S. PARKER, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, it is with extreme personal and official regret that I learned of the death of Mr. PARKER. I ask for the adoption of the resolutions which I now send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolutions.

The resolutions (S.Res. 115) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 115

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES S. PARKER, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE LYNN S. HORNOR, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LYNN S. HORNOR, a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolutions be read.

The resolutions (S.Res. 116) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LYNN S. HORNOR, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN D. CLARKE, OF NEW YORK

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions (H.Res. 207), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN D. CLARKE, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolutions be read.

The resolutions (S.Res. 117) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN D. CLARKE, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY W. WATSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions (H.Res. 208), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY W. WATSON, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I learned with deep regret of the death of Representative WATSON. I now send to the desk resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their consideration and adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S.Res. 118) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY W. WATSON, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BOLIVAR E. KEMP, OF LOUISIANA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions (H.Res. 205) were read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BOLIVAR E. KEMP, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S.Res. 119) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. BOLIVAR E. KEMP, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Members of the House of Representatives, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 8, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1934

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The following-named persons to be Assistant Secretaries of State, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

R. Walton Moore, of Virginia.

Francis Bowes Sayre, of Massachusetts.

Sumner Welles, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment to the offices to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hal H. Sevier, of Texas, to Chile.

William Christian Bullitt, of Pennsylvania, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY

Sheldon Whitehouse, of New York, to Colombia.

Matthew E. Hanna, of Ohio, to Guatemala.

Edward Albright, of Tennessee, to Finland.

George H. Earle, 3d, of Pennsylvania, to Austria.

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, to Nicaragua.

Charles S. Wilson, of Maine, to Yugoslavia.

Leo R. Sack, of Pennsylvania, to Costa Rica.

Fay A. des Portes, of South Carolina, to Bolivia.

Meredith Nicholson, of Indiana, to Paraguay.

Post Wheeler, of Washington, to Albania.

Antonio C. Gonzalez, of New York, to Panama.

John Van A. MacMurray, of Maryland, to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

James Marion Baker, of South Carolina, to Siam.

Frederick A. Sterling, of Texas, to Bulgaria.

Bert Fish, of Florida, to Egypt.

W. W. McDowell, of Montana, to the Irish Free State.

William H. Hornibrook, of Utah, to Persia.

Grenville T. Emmet, of New York, to the Netherlands.

The following-named Foreign Service officers to be diplomatic and consular officers of the grades to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

CONSULS GENERAL

John G. Erhardt, of New York.

O. Gaylord Marsh, of Washington.

Graham H. Kemper, of Kentucky.

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Whitney Young, of New York.

Robert F. Fernald, of Maine.

John C. Shillock, Jr., of Oregon.

James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.

Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.

John L. Bouchal, of Nebraska.

Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.

Robert Y. Jarvis, of California.

Richard S. Huestis, of New York.

W. Quincy Stanton, of New York.

Stanley G. Slavens, of Texas.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, CLASS 1

Thomas M. Wilson, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1 of the United States of America, effective as of July 28, 1933.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Marion Glass Banister, of Virginia, to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States in place of George O. Barnes, resigned.

REGISTER OF THE TREASURY

William W. Durbin, of Ohio, to be Register of the Treasury in place of Edward E. Jones.

ASSISTANT REGISTER OF THE TREASURY

Byrd Leavell, of Virginia, to be Assistant Register of the Treasury in place of Frank A. DeGroot.

SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Eldon P. King, of Ontario, Oreg., to be Special Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue in place of Pressly R. Baldrige, resigned.

ASSAYER OF THE MINT

Bruce B. LaFollette, of Gilman, Colo., to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., in place of Clarence C. Malmstrom.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

Mark A. Skinner, of Denver, Colo., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., in place of Frank E. Shepard.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF THE MINT

Hugh T. Rippetto, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be Assayer in Charge of the Mint of the United States at New Orleans, La., to fill an existing vacancy.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the board of directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for terms of 6 years, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Elbert G. Bennett, of Utah.

Walter J. Cummings, of Illinois.

GOVERNOR OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

William I. Myers, of New York, to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

INTERMEDIATE CREDIT COMMISSIONER IN THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

George M. Brennan, of Illinois, to be Intermediate Credit Commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration.

PRODUCTION CREDIT COMMISSIONER IN THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Sterling Marion Garwood, of Arkansas, to be Production Credit Commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration.

LAND BANK COMMISSIONER IN THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Albert Simon Goss, of Washington, to be Land Bank Commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration.

COOPERATIVE BANK COMMISSIONER IN THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Francis Winfred Peck, of Minnesota, to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONERS

The following-named persons to be Federal Trade Commissioners for the terms indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James M. Landis, of Massachusetts, for the term expiring September 25, 1940.

George C. Mathews, of Wisconsin, for the remainder of the term expiring September 25, 1938.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDIATION

Frank P. Glass, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Mediation for a term expiring 5 years after January 1, 1933, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The following-named persons for appointment as Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until their successors are appointed and qualified, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

George E. Allen, of the District of Columbia.

Melvin C. Hazen, of the District of Columbia.

COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS

Isador Lubin, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo., vice Walter Spencer, whose term has expired.

William F. Jackson, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at The Dalles, Oreg., vice Robert J. Carsner, deceased.

Ellis Purlee, of California, to be register of the land office at Sacramento, Calif., vice John C. Ing, whose appointment will be terminated.

Chris Bertsch, of North Dakota, to be register of the land office at Bismarck, N.Dak., vice Charles Gilbert Boise, whose term has expired.

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Edward W. Griffin, of Alaska, to be secretary of the Territory of Alaska, vice Karl Theile, whose appointment has been terminated.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Antoinette Funk, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice Thomas C. Havell, resigned, but who has been appointed to another position.

RECORDER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Miss Ruth Lockett, of California, to be recorder of the General Land Office, vice Mrs. Emma L. Warren, whose appointment has been terminated.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION AND STEAMBOAT INSPECTION

Francis William J. Buchner, of Pennsylvania, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Supervising Inspector, Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Seldon R. Glenn, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kentucky in place of Emil S. Helburn, resigned.

Joseph Wolf, of Staples, Minn., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Minnesota in place of Levi M. Willcuts, resigned.

Peter M. Gagne, of Somersworth, N.H., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire in place of John H. Field, resigned.

Homer M. Adkins, of Little Rock, Ark., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas in place of Andrew J. Russell, resigned.

Joseph V. Broderick, of Valley Falls, R.I., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island in place of Frank A. Page, resigned.

Edward G. Dolan, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut in place of Robert O. Eaton, resigned.

J. Edwin Larson, of Florida, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Florida in place of Peter H. Miller, resigned.

Carter H. Harrison, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois in place of Gregory T. Van Meter, resigned.

Vincent Y. Dallman, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Illinois in place of Oliver G. Addleman, resigned.

Clinton A. Clauson, of Maine, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Maine in place of Frank J. Ham, resigned.

Joseph P. Carney, of Massachusetts, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts in place of Thomas W. White, resigned.

Horatio J. Abbott, of Michigan, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Michigan, in place of Fred L. Woodworth, resigned.

Dan M. Nee, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri, in place of Dan G. Stewart, resigned.

Almon G. Rasquin, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York, in place of Walter E. Corwin, resigned.

Frank J. Shaughnessy, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-first district of New York, in place of Jesse W. Clarke.

George T. McGowan, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-eighth district of New York, in place of Gilbert T. Sugden, resigned.

Thomas J. Conner, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio, in place of Louis J. Huwe, resigned.

Charles H. Graves, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the tenth district of Ohio, in place of William B. Guitteau, resigned.

Harry F. Busey, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio, in place of Newton M. Miller, resigned.

Carl E. Moore, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, in place of Carl F. Routzahn, resigned.

Leo C. Mundy, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to be collector of internal revenue for the twelfth district of Pennsylvania, in place of David W. Phillips, resigned.

Willard F. Deputy, of Laurel, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of Wallace S. Handy, resigned.

Nathaniel B. Early, Jr., of Ruckersville, Va., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia, in place of A. Pendleton Strother, resigned.

Daniel D. Moore, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, in place of Lawrence A. Merrigan.

William B. Riley, of Watervliet, N.Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy.

Frank Scofield, of Hillsboro, Tex., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Texas, in place of Alexander S. Walker, deceased.

James J. Hoey, of New York, N.Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, in place of William Duggan, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Raymond Miller, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., in place of Thomas T. Wilson.

Margaret M. McQuilkin, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 48, with headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah, in place of Jennie P. Musser, resigned.

Allie J. Angle, of Florida, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., in place of Sidney C. Brown, resigned.

Ralph W. Wescott, of Haddonfield, N.J., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district no. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of Collins B. Allen.

William H. Bartley, of Montana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont., in place of Charles L. Sheridan.

Adrian Pool, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex., in place of Manuel B. Otero, resigned.

James T. Travers, of Duluth, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., in place of Curtis M. Johnson.

S. Scott Beck, of Chestertown, Md., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district no. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of Lawrence B. Towers.

Samuel T. Ladd, of Portsmouth, N.H., to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district no. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Dwight Hall, resigned.

Henry V. Schwalbach, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 37, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis., in place of Walter J. Wilde.

Agnes M. Hodge, of Minneapolis, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn., in place of Carl Eastwood.

Fountain Rothwell, of Missouri, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., in place of Louis M. Hall, resigned.

John H. Dooley, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine, in place of Frank M. Hume.

Harry T. Foley, of Yonkers, N.Y., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district no. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

Thomas M. Lynch, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district no. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y., in place of Frederick J. H. Kracke, resigned.

Wray E. Fleming, of Indiana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of George M. Foland.

Newton A. Milton, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg., in place of Edward M. Croisan.

Gilbert A. Dailey, of Baltimore, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of Charles H. Holtzman, resigned.

I. Walke Truxton, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va., in place of Joseph L. Crupper, resigned.

Howell Cone, of Statesboro, Ga., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga., in place of Marion O. Dunning, resigned.

Fannie Dixon Welch, of Columbia, Conn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn., in place of Elwyn T. Clark.

Alfred A. Cohn, of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif., in place of Howard W. Seager, resigned.

Stephen M. Driscoll, of St. Albans, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., in place of Fred B. Thomas.

COAST GUARD

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States:

Lt. Niels S. Haugen to be lieutenant commander, to rank as such from November 1, 1932.

Lt. Harold S. Berdine to be lieutenant commander, to rank as such from July 21, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward W. Holtz to be lieutenant, to rank as such from March 19, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles L. Duke to be lieutenant, to rank as such from March 19, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Herbert F. Walsh to be lieutenant, to rank as such from March 19, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edwin J. Roland to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Peter V. Colmar to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Bowerman to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Allen Winbeck to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William B. Chiswell to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Oliver A. Peterson to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Marius De Martino to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles M. Perrott to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stanley F. Piekos to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Carl G. Bowman to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Lowell C. Gibson to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) James C. Wendland to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Perry S. Lyons to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Richard M. Ross to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John A. Dirks to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Harry A. Loughlin to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Henry J. Wuensch to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George W. Nelson to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William P. Hawley to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hans F. Slade to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John N. Zeller to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Romeo J. Borromey to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Donald B. MacDiarmid to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Garrett Van A. Graves to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William B. Scheibel to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Bret H. Brallier to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Miller to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John W. Malen to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 16, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Petros D. Mills to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 16, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gordon P. McGowan to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 16, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Donald D. Hesler to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 16, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Marvin T. Braswell to be lieutenant, to rank as such from May 16, 1933.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Kenneth S. Davis to be lieutenant, to rank as such from July 23, 1933.

Ensign William Schissler to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign William E. Sinton to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign George A. Knudsen to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Carl U. Peterson to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign John R. Stewart to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign John S. Cole to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Arthur J. Hesford to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Joseph D. Harrington to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Sidney F. Porter to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Charles E. Toft to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign William L. Maloney to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign William L. Clemmer to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Ralph R. Curry to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Harold J. Doebler to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Edmund E. Fahey to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Kenneth C. Phillips to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign George C. Lindauer to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Spencer F. Hewins to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Clifford R. MacLean to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Henry F. Stolfi to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign John F. Harding to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign True G. Miller to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Herman T. Diehl to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Leonard T. Jones to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Henry F. Garcia to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Searcey J. Lowrey to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Samuel L. Denty to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Ensign Peery L. Stinson to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from June 7, 1933.

Constructor Frederick A. Hunnewell to be constructor with the rank of commander, to rank as such from August 29, 1933.

Ensign Henry St. Clair Sharp to be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank as such from May 15, 1933.

Lt. John McCann to be lieutenant commander, to rank as such from October 24, 1932.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers in the Public Health Service:

Asst. Sanitary Eng. Omar C. Hopkins to be passed assistant sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 5, 1933.

Passed Asst. Surg. Fortunat A. Trole to be surgeon, to rank as such from May 13, 1933.

Passed Asst. Surg. Carl E. Rice to be surgeon, to rank as such from May 19, 1933.

Senior Surg. Edward R. Marshall to be medical director, to rank as such from August 15, 1933.

Senior Surg. Emil Krulish to be medical director, to rank as such from August 17, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Chapman H. Binford to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. John A. Trautman to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Joseph A. Bell to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Edward C. Rinck to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Gordon A. Abbott to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Sidney P. Cooper to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. George W. Bolin to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Elmer T. Ceder to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Waldemar C. Dreessen to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Noka B. Hon to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Otis L. Anderson to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Asst. Surg. Claude D. Head, Jr., to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 1, 1933.

Chief Pharmacist Benjamin E. Holsendorf to be passed assistant pharmacist, to rank as such from December 16, 1933.

Surg. Lon Oliver Weldon to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 16, 1933.

Surg. Howard Franklin Smith to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 18, 1933.

Surg. James Gayley Townsend to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from December 6, 1933.

Surg. William Howard Slaughter to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from December 9, 1933.

Surg. Joseph Bolten to be senior surgeon, to rank as such from July 26, 1933.

Passed Asst. Surg. LeGrand B. Byington to be surgeon, to rank as such from October 15, 1933.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harold Benjamin Fiske, United States Army, from August 1, 1933, vice Maj. Gen. Campbell King, United States Army, retired July 31, 1933.

Brig. Gen. Halstead Dorey, United States Army, from November 1, 1933, vice Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Winans, United States Army, retired October 31, 1933.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Vidmer, Cavalry, from August 21, 1933, vice Brig. Gen. Harold B. Fiske, United States Army, accepted appointment as major general, August 21, 1933.

Col. Thomas Emery Merrill, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933, vice Brig. Gen. Meriwether L. Walker, United States Army, retired September 30, 1933.

Col. Alexander Thompson Ovenshine, Infantry, from November 1, 1933, vice Brig. Gen. Halstead Dorey, United States Army, accepted appointment as major general, November 1, 1933.

Col. William Keith Naylor, Infantry, from December 1, 1933, vice Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Castner, United States Army, retired November 30, 1933.

Col. Robert Osborn Van Horn, Infantry, from December 1, 1933, vice Brig. Gen. George H. Jamerson, United States Army, retired November 30, 1933.

To be Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning December 1, 1933, with rank from December 1, 1933

Col. Arthur Winton Brown, Judge Advocate General's Department, vice Maj. Gen. Blanton Winship, Judge Advocate General, retired November 30, 1933.

To be Chief of Engineers, with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning October 18, 1933, with rank from October 1, 1933

Col. Edward Murphy Markham, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Gen. Lytle Brown, Chief of Engineers, whose term of office expired September 30, 1933.

To be Assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of 4 years, beginning October 18, 1933, with rank from September 19, 1933

Col. Patrick William Guiney, Quartermaster Corps, vice Brig. Gen. Louis H. Bash, Assistant to the Quartermaster General, whose term of office expired September 18, 1933.

To be Chief of Chaplains, with the rank of colonel, for the period of 4 years beginning December 23, 1933, with rank from December 23, 1933

Chaplain Alva Jennings Brasted (lieutenant colonel), United States Army, vice Chaplain Julian E. Yates (colonel), Chief of Chaplains, whose term of office expired December 22, 1933.

INFANTRY

To be second lieutenant with rank from July 15, 1933

Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, graduate, United States Military Academy, class of 1933.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1933

First Lt. Roger Hubbard Allbee, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Urho Robert Merikangas, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. John Bernard Herman, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Clifford Gordon Blitch, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Max Naimark, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Vernon James Erkenbeck, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Arthur Herbert Thompson, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Wilson Theodore Smith, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Clarendon Barron Woods, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Joe Alexander Bain, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Cecil Spencer Mollohan, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Francis Whitney Hall, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Joseph Sibley Cirlot, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Richard Howard Eckhardt, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. John Mars Caldwell, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Charles Parmalee Ward, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Elmer Arthur Lodmell, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Lester Paul Veigel, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. George Lewis Beatty, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Harold Irvin Amory, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. John Albert Egan, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. George Gustavo Guiteras, Medical Corps Reserve.
First Lt. Edgar Louis Alson, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 5, 1933

First Lt. Robert Purcell Rea, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 10, 1933

First Lt. Arthur Eugene White, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 29, 1933

First Lt. Frank Anthony Minas, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from August 1, 1933

First Lt. Henry Schuldt Murphey, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from August 26, 1933

First Lt. Carl Robert Darnall, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenants with rank from September 1, 1933

First Lt. George Merle Powell, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Clesson Beckwith, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Charles Henry Morhouse, Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant with rank from September 11, 1933

First Lt. John Lemoin Crawford, Medical Corps Reserve.

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenant with rank from October 1, 1933

First Lt. William Thomas Williams, Dental Corps Reserve.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1933

Second Lt. Wayne Otho Kester, Veterinary Corps Reserve.

Second Lt. Robert Arthur Boyce, Jr., Veterinary Corps Reserve.

Second Lt. Clarence Leonard Taylor, Veterinary Corps Reserve.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be second lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1933

Technical Sgt. Carrol Conrad Barrick, Medical Department.

Technical Sgt. Thomas Raymond Jones, Medical Department.

Staff Sgt. Cornelius John Curran, Medical Department.

Staff Sgt. Gerard Adrien Belanger, Medical Department.

Staff Sgt. Guy Wycoff Harlow, Medical Department.

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplains with the rank of first lieutenant

First Lt. Elmer Emil Tiedt, Chaplains' Reserve, with rank from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Stanislaus Joseph Ryczek, Chaplains' Reserve, with rank from September 28, 1933.

First Lt. John Edward Duffy, Chaplains' Reserve, with rank from November 6, 1933.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Irving Howard Engleman, Infantry (assigned to duty with Quartermaster Corps), July 14, 1933, with rank from October 17, 1927.

Capt. Wannie Lee Bartley, Infantry (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), October 6, 1933, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Clarence Walter Richmond, Cavalry (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), October 11, 1933, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lt. William Arthur Davis, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), August 15, 1933, with rank from June 11, 1931.

Second Lt. Merwin Scott Dickson, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), August 15, 1933, with rank from June 11, 1931.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Edward Pont Mechling, Cavalry (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from March 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Charles Ralph Pinkerton, Cavalry (detailed in Ordnance Department), August 1, 1933, with rank from June 9, 1928.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, Infantry, July 17, 1933, with rank from June 13, 1933.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Second Lt. Roy Kay Kauffman, Infantry, September 18, 1933, with rank from June 11, 1931.

TO INFANTRY

Col. Frederick William Coleman, Finance Department (Major General, Chief of Finance), December 7, 1933, with rank from April 27, 1921.

First Lt. Charles Vernon Barnum, Cavalry, December 7, 1933, with rank from July 1, 1920.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Charles Hardin Anderson, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. John Edwin Barr, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 14, 1933, with rank from June 11, 1931.

Second Lt. Byram Arnold Bunch, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Paul Delmont Bunker, Jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Daniel Stone Campbell, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. George Dowery Campbell, Jr., Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Robert Lynn Carver, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. James Hutchings Cunningham, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Leo Peter Dahl, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Thomas Connell Darcy, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. William Madison Garland, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. James Walter Gurr, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Donald Linwood Hardy, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Hunter Harris, Jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Loren Boyd Hillsinger, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Kenneth Burton Hobson, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Frank Lester Howard, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Harvey Porter Huglin, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Frank Greenleaf Jamison, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Joe William Kelly, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. David Hamilton Kennedy, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. John Paul McConnell, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Andrew Meulenberg, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Thomas Charles Morgan, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Eugene Porter Mussett, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Nicholas Earnest Powel, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Romulus Wright Puryear, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Clifford Harcourt Rees, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Edwin Guldlin Simenson, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Ray James Stecker, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Stanley Ronald Stewart, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Edward Willis Suarez, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. John Reynolds Sutherland, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Robert Haynes Terrill, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Benjamin Jepson Webster, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Sam Houston Wiseman, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Torgils Grimkel Wold, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 10, 1932.

Second Lt. Joseph Buford Zimmerman, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 14, 1933, with rank from June 11, 1931.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Edward Appleton Keyes, Cavalry, from July 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. William James O'Loughlin, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Herbert Edward Mann, Cavalry, from July 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Francis Augustus Ruggles, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Henry Tilghman Bull, Cavalry, from August 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Howard Russell Smalley, Cavalry, from August 10, 1933.

Lt. Col. John Scott, Infantry, from August 21, 1933.

Lt. Col. Noble James Wiley, Infantry, from August 22, 1933.

Lt. Col. George Catlett Marshall, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Talbot Smith, Cavalry, from September 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Frank Edwin Davis, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. William Wallace Overton, Cavalry, from October 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Samuel Turner Mackall, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Walter Campbell Short, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Frank Fanning Jewett, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Augustus Francis Dannemiller, Infantry, from October 17, 1933.

Lt. Col. Alfred Asa Hickox, Infantry, from October 27, 1933.

Lt. Col. Samuel Greaner Talbott, Adjutant General's Department, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Charles Macon Wesson, Ordnance Department, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Glen Fay Jenks, Ordnance Department, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Clarence Beaumont Ross, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Jordan, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. William Storrs Bowen, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. William Fitzhugh Jones, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Brainerd Taylor, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Emmet Roland Harris, Finance Department, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Avery John Cooper, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Frank Geere, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. George Leftwich Wertenbaker, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Walter Campbell Baker, Chemical Warfare Service, from December 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Richard Irving McKenney, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 1, 1933.

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Clark, Quartermaster Corps, from December 1, 1933.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Louis Roberts Dougherty, Field Artillery, from July 1, 1933.

Maj. Samuel Roland Hopkins, Field Artillery, from July 1, 1933.

- Maj. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Maj. John Blackwell Maynard, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Maj. Jacob Herman Rudolph, Air Corps, from August 1, 1933.
- Maj. Elbe Allen Lathrop, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.
- Maj. Raymond Ceward Baird, Infantry, from August 10, 1933.
- Maj. Arthur Griffith Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 21, 1933.
- Maj. Matthew Addison Palen, Infantry, from August 22, 1933.
- Maj. Frederick LeRoy Martin, Air Corps, from August 31, 1933.
- Maj. Elza Charles Johnson, Judge Advocate General's Department, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. Frank Cornelius Reilly, Adjutant General's Department, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. Walter Dew Cline, Judge Advocate General's Department, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. Henry Lawson Rice, Ordnance Department, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. Harry Montague Trippe, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. John Soule Butler, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. Charles Mason Roberts, Ordnance Department, from September 1, 1933.
- Maj. William Buerkle, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Maj. Fredrick Clifford Rogers, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Maj. Robert Clifton Garrett, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Maj. Burton Ebenezer Bowen, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Maj. Robert Ross Welshmer, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Maj. Otto Harry Schrader, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 17, 1933.
- Maj. Robert Elton Guthrie, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 27, 1933.
- Maj. William Robert Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Paul Henry Herman, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Oscar Czar Warner, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Frank Sheldon Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. William Skinner Fulton, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Thomas Ogden Humphreys, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Donald MacQueen Ashbridge, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Hollis LeRoy Muller, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Eli Elmer Bennett, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. William McCleave, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Stuart Chapin Godfrey, Corps of Engineers, from November 1, 1933.
- Maj. Francis Clark Harrington, Corps of Engineers, from November 1, 1933, subject to examination required by law.
- Maj. Cleveland C. Gee, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. John Roy Douglas Matheson, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. Charles Joel Taylor, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. Edwin Hall Marks, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. Earl North, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. Gilbert Van Buren Wilkes, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Maj. Frank Schaffer Besson, Corps of Engineers, from December 4, 1933.

To be majors

- Capt. Joseph Clark Addington, Infantry, from May 24, 1933.
- Capt. Allison Joseph Barnett, Infantry, from June 1, 1933.
- Capt. Harrison Mortimer Duffill, Quartermaster Corps, from June 1, 1933.
- Capt. Thomas Leroy Holland, Quartermaster Corps, from June 1, 1933.
- Capt. John Andrew Porter, Quartermaster Corps, from June 1, 1933.
- Capt. Herbert Lee Kidwell, Quartermaster Corps, from June 24, 1933.
- Capt. George Frederick Unmacht, Chemical Warfare Service, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. John Graham Colgan, Air Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. George Pollock Bush, Signal Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. Thomas Jefferson McGrath, Quartermaster Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. Thomas Otis Baker, Quartermaster Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. George Henry Hahn, Quartermaster Corps, from July 1, 1933.
- Capt. John North Douglas, Quartermaster Corps, from July 9, 1933.
- Capt. William Settle Evans, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1933.
- Capt. Alonzo Lincoln Littell, Quartermaster Corps, from August 1, 1933.
- Capt. Clarence Longacre, Quartermaster Corps, from August 1, 1933.
- Capt. Percival Simon Holmes, Quartermaster Corps, from August 1, 1933.
- Capt. Clarence Lloyd Middleton, Quartermaster Corps, from August 7, 1933.
- Capt. George Herbert Schumacher, Quartermaster Corps, from August 10, 1933.
- Capt. Walter Moody Tenney, Field Artillery, from August 21, 1933.
- Capt. Arthur Shelby Levinsohn, Quartermaster Corps, from August 22, 1933.
- Capt. Richard Bartholomew Moran, Signal Corps, from August 24, 1933.
- Capt. Arthur Oscar Walsh, Finance Department, from August 30, 1933.
- Capt. David McGoodwin Speed, Quartermaster Corps, from August 31, 1933.
- Capt. Harry Lauman Waggoner, Quartermaster Corps, from August 31, 1933.
- Capt. Joseph Dixon Hahn, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. August Christian Jensen, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. Walter Herbert Wells, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. James Benjamin Ettridge, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. William Harvey Dukes, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. Murray Benjamin Dilley, Signal Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. LeRoy Lutes, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. Emil Herbert Block, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Capt. Royal Granville Jenks, Finance Department, from September 1, 1933.

Capt. William Cassidy, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.

Capt. Richard Thomas Edwards, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.

Capt. Alexander Effray Whitworth, Signal Corps, from September 11, 1933.

Capt. David Andrew Watt, Adjutant General's Department, from September 26, 1933.

Capt. Welcome Porter Waltz, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. John Walter Crissy, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Edwin Hugh Johnson, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Russel McKee Herrington, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Leonard Smith Doten, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Lawrence Aloysius Quinn, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Lewis Abram Pulling, Cavalry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Dallas Royce Alfonte, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Fred Matthew Fogle, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Guy Hudson Doshier, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933.

Capt. Charles Erwin Rayens, Infantry, from October 17, 1933.

Capt. Charles Hudson Jones, Infantry, from October 27, 1933.

Capt. Sidney Feagin Dunn, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. William Hones, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Albert Charles Chesledon, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Breckinridge Atwater Day, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Joseph Kennedy, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. William Harold Joiner, Ordnance Department, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. George David Shea, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Philip Blaine Fryer, Cavalry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Woodrow Wilson Woodbridge, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Donald Coe Hawley, Cavalry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Vernon Lhreau Padgett, Cavalry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Gilmer Meriwether Bell, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Roy Sloan, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Jay Ward MacKelvie, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Glenn Dewitt Hufford, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Wilbur Clynton Carlan, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Francis Truman Bonsteel, Cavalry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Albert Alan Allen, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. Paul Revere Hudson, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

Capt. William Edwin Barott, Cavalry, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. Frank Nelson, Cavalry, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. Herman Frederick Rathjen, Cavalry, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. George Ross Rede, Field Artillery, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. Ralph Hall, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. John Homer Carriker, Field Artillery, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. Benjamin Harrison Hensley, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

Capt. Jerome Pickett, Infantry, from December 4, 1933.

To be captains

First Lt. Clarence Lionel Adcock, Corps of Engineers, from May 24, 1933.

First Lt. Keryn ap Rice, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. Charles Stuart Ward, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Morehead Underwood, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Bryan Newman, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Marshall Young, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Creel Marshall, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1933.

First Lt. Walter Ernest Lorence, Corps of Engineers, from June 10, 1933.

First Lt. Lucius DuBignon Clay, Corps of Engineers, from June 19, 1933.

First Lt. Lloyd Ernst Mielenz, Corps of Engineers, from June 24, 1933.

First Lt. Pierre Alexander Agnew, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Alexander Murray Neilson, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Hoel Smith Bishop, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Robert Habersham Elliott, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Thomas Hay Nixon, Ordnance Department, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Anderson Thomas William Moore, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Reginald Whitaker, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Eugene Mead Caffey, Corps of Engineers, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Milton Alexander, Cavalry, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Milligan Gillespie, Air Corps, from July 9, 1933.

First Lt. Milo Benson Barragan, Field Artillery, from July 18, 1933.

First Lt. Paul Ludwig Deylitz, Ordnance Department, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Ernest William Gruhn, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Edwin Luther Sibert, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Stubbs Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Faulkner Pichel, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Haleston, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Charles Clifton Blanchard, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Clyde Beauchamp Bell, Cavalry, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Winston Holt, Field Artillery, from August 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Magruder Bethel, Cavalry, from August 7, 1933.

First Lt. Clarence Page Townsley, Field Artillery, from August 10, 1933.

First Lt. Robert Hilton Offley, Infantry, from August 21, 1933.

First Lt. John Mesick, Field Artillery, from August 22, 1933.

First Lt. Francis Parker Tompkins, Cavalry, from August 24, 1933.

First Lt. John Arthur Weeks, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 28, 1933.

First Lt. Frederick William Gerhard, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service, from August 30, 1933.

First Lt. Cornelius Comegys Jadwin, Cavalry, from August 31, 1933.

First Lt. Jacob Gunn Sucher, Ordnance Department, from August 31, 1933.

First Lt. Howard Harvey Newman, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Richard Gray McKee, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Nevins Dorsey Young, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Lillard Barriger, Cavalry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Frederick Williams Fenn, Cavalry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Charles Kovarik, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Paul William George, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Jonathan Lane Holman, Ordnance Department, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Wynot Rush Irish, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Francis Earle Rundell, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Royal Adam Machle, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Leonard Randall Nachman, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Clark Hazen Mitchell, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Maynadier Miley, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. George Baird Hudson, Cavalry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Harry Clay Mewshaw, Cavalry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Alfred Armstrong McNamee, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Francis Joseph Achatz, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Leon Calhoun Boineau, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Harold Wilbert Gould, Infantry, from September 11, 1933.

First Lt. George Bittmann Barth, Field Artillery, from September 12, 1933.

First Lt. Harry Benham Sherman, Infantry, from September 15, 1933.

First Lt. Frank Thorpe Turner, Cavalry, from September 26, 1933.

First Lt. Thomas Quinton Donaldson, Jr., Cavalry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Philip Edward Gallagher, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Carroll Kimball Leeper, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Charlie Quillian Lifsey, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Hugh McCalla Wilson, Jr., Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Dorr Hazlehurst, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Robert Trueheart Foster, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Frederick von Harten Kimble, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Jones Hanlon, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Harold McFall, Finance Department, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Howard Arnold Craig, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Barney Leland Meeden, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. David Robert Stinson, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Theodore Morris, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. John May Connor, Finance Department, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. George Wald, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Armor Simpson Heffley, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Don Elwood Lowry, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Robert Sweeley, Air Corps, from October 17, 1933.

First Lt. George Allan McHenry, Jr., Air Corps, from October 17, 1933.

First Lt. Seward William Hulse, Quartermaster Corps, from October 27, 1933.

First Lt. Claude Leslie Gamble, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Charles Wolfe, Corps of Engineers, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Lemuel Edwin Edwards, Finance Department, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Franklin Battley, Chemical Warfare Service, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Carlyle Howe Ridenour, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Russell Carrigan MacDonald, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Bennett Edward Meyers, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. George Mitchell Grimes, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Edward Bethel Jackson, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Paul Hyde Prentiss, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Robert Storie Heald, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Warren Arthur Maxwell, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Walter Hannum Carlisle, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Henry Papenfoth, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr., Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Walter Leo Weible, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Rupert Edison Starr, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. George Edgar Rice, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Leonard Dickson Weddington, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Lowell Whittier Bassett, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Henry Doherty, Finance Department, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Edward Michael Powers, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Maurice Edgar Jennings, Chemical Warfare Service, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Felix Marcus Alexander, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Howell Harrell, Infantry, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Paul Edmund Burrows, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. George Harold Brown, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Elmer Daniel Perrin, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Dale Vincent Gaffney, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.

First Lt. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Grant Heninger, Field Artillery, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Stanley Powloski, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Milton Harman, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Harry Lincoln Calvin, Quartermaster Corps, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Berbert, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Chester Carroll Hough, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Conrad Palmer Hardy, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Clifford Irving Hunn, Cavalry, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Patrick Francis Craig, Chemical Warfare Service, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Chester Howard Elmes, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Edward Vanmeter Macatee, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Vernon Hart, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Wilbur Fisk Browder, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Richard Hartnett Magee, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry Harold Reily, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.

First Lt. Henry DuPree, Infantry, from December 2, 1933.

First Lt. John Caraway Arrowsmith, Corps of Engineers, from December 4, 1933.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. William Jordan Verbeck, Infantry, from May 24, 1933.

Second Lt. Aloysius Joseph Lepping, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Joseph Ganahl, Field Artillery, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Fay Roscoe Upthegrove, Air Corps, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. John Marion Moore, Field Artillery, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Stuart Wood, Field Artillery, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Lawrence Edward Shaw, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Matthew Kemp Deichmann, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 10, 1933.

Second Lt. Nathan Alton McLamb, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 10, 1933.

Second Lt. William Jefferson Glasgow, Jr., Infantry, from June 19, 1933.

Second Lt. Charles Bertody Stone, 3d, Air Corps, from June 24, 1933.

Second Lt. Frank Thomas Ostenberg, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. John Harold Kochevar, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Ernest Benjamin Gray, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Douglas Campbell, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. William Joseph Phelan, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Joy Thomas Wrean, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. John Joseph Holst, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Guy Ernest Thrums, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Arthur Roth, Coast Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Carl Sherman Graybeal, Infantry, from July 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Ralph Wise Zwicker, Infantry, from July 9, 1933.

Second Lt. Woodson Finch Hocker, Infantry, from July 18, 1933.

Second Lt. Cyril Edward Williams, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Vachel Davis Whatley, Jr., Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Harry Ellery McKinney, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Carl Elliott Lundquist, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Antulio Segarra, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. George Van Horn Moseley, Jr., Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Roy William Axup, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. John Walker Kirby, Air Corps, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Forrest Anthony Hornisher, Infantry, from August 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Raymond Earle Bell, Infantry, from August 7, 1933.

Second Lt. Dudley George Strickler, Infantry, from August 10, 1933.

Second Lt. Dana Powers McGown, Infantry, from August 17, 1933.

Second Lt. Charles Boal Ewing, Infantry, from August 21, 1933.

Second Lt. Felix Alex Todd, Jr., Infantry, from August 22, 1933.

Second Lt. Barney Avant Daughtry, Infantry, from August 24, 1933.

Second Lt. Philip DeWitt Ginder, Infantry, from August 28, 1933.

Second Lt. Ralph Edwin Doty, Infantry, from August 30, 1933.

Second Lt. Howell Hopson Jordan, Infantry, from August 31, 1933.

Second Lt. Robert Frederick Sink, Infantry, from August 31, 1933.

Second Lt. Elmer Matthew Webb, Jr., Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. John Prame Kaylor, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Christian Gotthard Nelson, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Martin Joseph Morin, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Gilbert McKee Allen, Jr., Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Calvin Louis Whittle, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. George Emericus Bender, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Jack Henry Griffith, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Robert Campbell Aloe, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Montgomery McKee, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Nelson Irving Fooks, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Lawton Butler, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Marion Huggins, Air Corps, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Martin Moses, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Robert John West, Jr., Field Artillery, from September 1, 1933.

- Second Lt. Edgar Daniel Stark, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. David Drew Hedekin, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. James William Smyly, Jr., Infantry, from September 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Raymond Gregory Stanton, Infantry, from September 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Neil Bosworth Harding, Air Corps, from September 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Jesse Floyd Dressler, Infantry, from September 3, 1933.
- Second Lt. Willis Small Matthews, Infantry, from September 11, 1933.
- Second Lt. Robert Lewis Easton, Air Corps, from September 12, 1933.
- Second Lt. Henry Malone Bailey, Infantry, from September 15, 1933.
- Second Lt. Fred Leroy Thorpe, Infantry, from September 26, 1933.
- Second Lt. William Rapier Francis Bleakney, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Harold Henry Hunt, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Joseph Lawrence Dark, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Frank Keith Park, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Walter William Gross, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Joseph George Felber, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Otto Clyde George, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. John N. Jones, Air Corps, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Morris Miller Bauer, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Frank Alfred Lightfoot, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. John Richmond Pitman, Jr., Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. George Selman, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Earl Clarence Bergquist, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Richard Chase, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Albert Neil Hickey, Infantry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Ronald Irving Pride, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Royce Alison Drake, Cavalry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Paul Alfred Disney, Cavalry, from October 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Leo William De Rosier, Air Corps, from October 17, 1933.
- Second Lt. Gordon Philip Saville, Air Corps, from October 17, 1933.
- Second Lt. Charles Bernard Overacker, Jr., Air Corps, from October 27, 1933.
- Second Lt. George Henry Macnair, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. William Barwig Blaufuss, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Louis Howard Foote, Corps of Engineers, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. James Arthur Ellison, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Hoyt Leroy Prindle, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. James Franklin Walsh, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. George Richard Geer, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Donald Wright Benner, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Harry John Flatequal, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Herman Franklin Woolard, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Lawrence Henry Douthit, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. George Robert Acheson, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Frank Hamlet Robinson, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Waldine Winston Messmore, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Herbert Melvin Newstrom, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Allen Ralph Springer, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Franklin Calhoun Wolfe, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Ford Larimore Fair, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Ivan Maurice Palmer, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Joseph Gerard Hopkins, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Elmer Perry Rose, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. John Adams Austin, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Ford J. Lauer, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Fay Oliver Dice, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Herbert Everett Rice, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Edward Harold Porter, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Robert Leonard Schoenlein, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Frederick William Ott, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Wentworth Goss, Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. James Leslie Daniel, Jr., Air Corps, from November 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Budd John Peaslee, Air Corps, from November 4, 1933.
- Second Lt. Vera H. Wiseman, Infantry, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. John Franklin Egan, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Edgar Russell Todd, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Arthur LaSalle Smith, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Donald Dewey Arnold, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Clarence Thomas Mower, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Louie Percy Turner, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. James Laffeter Green, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Theodore Scott Riggs, Cavalry, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Frederick Jensen Dau, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. William Tell Hefley, Air Corps, from December 1, 1933.
- Second Lt. Roland Clough Brown, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Samuel Roberts Browning, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Lyle Edward Seeman, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

Second Lt. Raphael Brill Ezekiel, Corps of Engineers, from December 1, 1933.

Second Lt. William Dixon Smith, Corps of Engineers, from December 2, 1933.

Second Lt. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, 3d, Cavalry, from December 4, 1933.

Second Lt. Robert Scott Israel, Jr., Air Corps, from December 8, 1933.

Second Lt. David Andrew Watt, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from December 19, 1933.

Second Lt. Donald Bertrand Smith, Air Corps, from December 22, 1933.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Henry Church Pillsbury, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1933.

Lt. Col. Edgar King, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1933.

Lt. Col. Ray Woodman Bryan, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1933.

Lt. Col. William Hadley Richardson, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1933.

Lt. Col. William Kay Bartlett, Medical Corps, from June 15, 1933.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Bertram Foster Duckwall, Medical Corps, from November 15, 1933.

To be captains

First Lt. Richard Love Daniel, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Otis Otto Benson, Jr., Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Ernest Holden Parsons, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Kenneth Arthur Brewer, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Norman Wilhalm Anderson, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Paul Strimple Fancher, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Vinnie Hale Jeffress, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Kenneth Fredrick Ernst, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Theodore Longworth Finley, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Kermit Hoyt Gates, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Charles Lee Kirkpatrick, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Loyd Eugene Griffiths, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Jeffers Kennard, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Edward Miller Sager, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Allan Brodie Ramsay, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Achilles Lacy Tynes, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Robert Barrett Skinner, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Dwight Lawson, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joseph Pease Russell, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. James Little Murchison, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Norman Webb White, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. William Clarence Knott, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Paul Edmund Keller, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Albert Henry Robinson, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Frederick Blatt, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. John Randolph Copenhaver, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Cyril Edward McEnany, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Frank Yearsley Leaver, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Joe Harrell, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Leonard Neil Swanson, Medical Corps, from July 1, 1933.

First Lt. Armin Walter Leuschner, Medical Corps, from August 17, 1933.

First Lt. John Ellsworth Roberts, Medical Corps, from September 1, 1933.

First Lt. Ralph Vernon Plew, Medical Corps, from September 25, 1933.

First Lt. Wayne Glassburn Brandstadt, Medical Corps, from September 25, 1933.

First Lt. Edward James Kendricks, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Oliver Harold Waltrip, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1933.

First Lt. Thomas James Hartford, Medical Corps, from December 2, 1933.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Walter Lee Reesman, Dental Corps, from June 12, 1933.

Maj. Samuel John Randall, Dental Corps, from November 13, 1933.

Maj. Don Gordon Moore, Dental Corps, from November 13, 1933.

Maj. Oscar George Skelton, Dental Corps, from November 14, 1933.

Maj. Robert Beeghly Tobias, Dental Corps, from November 14, 1933.

Maj. Harry Clothey Peavey, Dental Corps, from November 14, 1933.

To be captains

First Lt. Tyler James Walker, Dental Corps (appointed first lieutenant, Dental Corps, during the recess of the Senate), from July 6, 1933.

First Lt. Wallace Jacob Morlock, Dental Corps (appointed first lieutenant, Dental Corps, during the recess of the Senate), from October 15, 1933.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Jacob Edward Behney, Veterinary Corps, from September 3, 1933.

Maj. Jesse Daniel Derrick, Veterinary Corps, from September 7, 1933.

Maj. Raymond Alexander Kelser, Veterinary Corps, from September 7, 1933.

Maj. Clell Bricker Perkins, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Horace Samuel Eakins, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Isaac Owen Gladish, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Jean Rossman Underwood, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Clifford Caswell Whitney, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Harold Edward Egan, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1933.

Maj. Christian William Greenlee, Veterinary Corps, from November 26, 1933.

Maj. William Henry Houston, Veterinary Corps, from November 27, 1933.

To be major

Capt. Jack Glendon Fuller, Veterinary Corps, from November 25, 1933.

To be captain

First Lt. Stanley McLeod Nevin, Veterinary Corps, from August 4, 1933.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Austin Taylor Getz, Veterinary Corps, from July 22, 1933.

Second Lt. Wesley Watson Bertz, Veterinary Corps, from August 4, 1933.

Second Lt. Edgerton Lynn Watson, Veterinary Corps, from August 4, 1933.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Paul Estabrooke Zuver, Medical Administrative Corps, from November 28, 1933.

Second Lt. Orion Victor Kempf, Medical Administrative Corps, from December 26, 1933.

Second Lt. Kindrick Ownby, Medical Administrative Corps, from December 26, 1933.

Second Lt. Robert Lee Black, Medical Administrative Corps, from December 26, 1933.

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplain with the rank of lieutenant colonel

Chaplain Alexander Daniel Sutherland (major), United States Army, from November 25, 1933.

To be chaplains with the rank of major

Chaplain Ivan Loveridge Bennett (captain), United States Army, from July 29, 1933.

Chaplain Monroe Starkey Caver (captain), United States Army, from August 1, 1933.

Chaplain John Knox Bodel (captain), United States Army, from August 16, 1933.

Chaplain William Roy Bradley (captain), United States Army, from August 24, 1933.

Chaplain James Lloyd McBride (captain), United States Army, from August 26, 1933.

Chaplain Thomas Lawrence McKenna (captain), United States Army, from August 27, 1933.

Chaplain Mylon Dickinson Merchant (captain), United States Army, from September 1, 1933.

Chaplain Maurice William Reynolds (captain), United States Army, from September 8, 1933.

Chaplain Henry Russell Westcott, Jr. (captain), United States Army, from September 27, 1933.

Chaplain Albert Floyd Vaughan (captain), United States Army, from October 2, 1933.

Chaplain Jodie Gibson Stewart (captain), United States Army, from October 7, 1933.

Chaplain Gynther Storaasli (captain), United States Army, from October 11, 1933.

Chaplain Commodore Robert Watkins (captain), United States Army, from October 20, 1933.

Chaplain Ivan Gochnauer Martin (captain), United States Army, from November 6, 1933.

Chaplain Edwin Burling (captain), United States Army, from December 28, 1933.

To be chaplains with the rank of captain

Chaplain Patrick James Ryan (first lieutenant), United States Army, from October 5, 1933.

Chaplain Frederick William Hagan (first lieutenant), United States Army, from December 2, 1933.

Chaplain Walter Hilary Paschal (first lieutenant), United States Army, from December 26, 1933.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Hugh Straughn, Philippine Scouts, from September 1, 1933.

Maj. Eacott Berton Miller, Philippine Scouts, from September 26, 1933.

To be major

Capt. James Williston Callahan, Jr., Philippine Scouts, from October 1, 1933.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Bienvenido Moba Alba, Philippine Scouts, from October 1, 1933.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. (temporary) John T. Myers to be a major general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933, with rank from the 1st day of October 1931.

Brig. Gen. John H. Russell to be a major general (temporary) in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Col. Charles H. Lyman to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Col. Louis McC. Little to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

Brig. Gen. Hugh Matthews, the quartermaster, to be the quartermaster of the Marine Corps with the rank of brigadier general for a period of 4 years from the 26th day of December 1933, with rank from the 26th day of December 1929.

Lt. Col. Charles R. Sanderson, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of colonel from the 1st day of September 1933.

Lt. Col. Walter N. Hill to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of December 1933.

Maj. Paul A. Capron to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Maj. John Potts to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

Maj. Edward A. Ostermann to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of December 1933.

Capt. Arthur H. Turner to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Capt. James F. Moriarty to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

Capt. Peter Conachy to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Capt. Walter T. H. Galliford to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of December 1933.

Capt. Fred G. Patchen to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

First Lt. Samuel A. Milliken to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1931.

First Lt. William H. Hollingsworth to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June 1932.

First Lt. Thomas J. Cushman to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1933.

First Lt. John D. O'Leary to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

First Lt. Clyde H. Hartsel to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

First Lt. Delmer Byfield to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

First Lt. Arthur C. Small to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

First Lt. James Ackerman to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

First Lt. Ralph C. Alburger to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. Benjamin W. Atkinson, Jr., to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. William L. Bales to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. Frederick C. Biebusch to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. Gale T. Cummings to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. Terrell J. Crawford to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

First Lt. Howard B. Enyart to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1933.

First Lt. George Esau to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of December 1933.

First Lt. Edwin J. Farrell to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of December 1933.

First Lt. Augustus H. Fricke to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

First Lt. Julian N. Frisbie to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

Second Lt. Samuel S. Jack to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1933.

Second Lt. Henry R. Paige to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Second Lt. Joseph W. Earnshaw to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Second Lt. Walter L. J. Bayler to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Second Lt. Marion L. Dawson, Jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Second Lt. Harold G. Newhart to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1933.

Second Lt. Frank M. June to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

Second Lt. George H. Potter to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1933.

Second Lt. Earl S. Piper to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of October 1933.

Second Lt. Robert A. Olson to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of October 1933.

Second Lt. Francis M. McAlister to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Second Lt. Jack P. Juhan to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Second Lt. Jesse S. Cook, Jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Second Lt. Miles S. Newton to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Second Lt. Archie E. O'Neil to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1933.

Second Lt. Allen C. Koonce to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1933.

Second Lt. Alan Shapley to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of December 1933.

Second Lt. David F. O'Neill to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

Second Lt. John C. Munn to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

Second Lt. Jaime Sabater to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1934.

James M. Beam, a citizen of Illinois, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, revocable for 2 years, from the 1st day of July 1933.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, who art time without end, space without bound; O Thou who dost hold this immense and manifold world in the bond of universal unity, again peace, power, and certainty have smiled upon us from Thy holy will. Do Thou accept our gratitude for Thy unutterable condescension. We pray Thee that Thou wouldst move our minds along with Thine—clearer and higher—and may we cherish our freedom in wise and loving service. Grant us courage to labor as we know and the will to fashion as we feel. Father in Heaven, write Thy decrees in our breasts and give us the fortitude to sift the good from the ill, the pure from the stained, and the noble from the base. Direct us by Thy spirit, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

LOANS TO INDUSTRY FOR WORKING CAPITAL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reassembled in regular session on January 3, I introduced a bill which is designed to assist the business interests of the United States to make progress toward normal recovery and to open the way to reemployment in industry on a large scale. The bill proposes to start the wheels of industry by broadening the loan basis of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so that loans may be made direct to approved industries for working capital. Under the existing law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has power to make loans only to banks, mortgage-loan companies, railroads, and insurance companies. The bill I have introduced would add to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law as it now stands, the following language:

To aid in the resumption and carrying on of normal business and industrial activities the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make direct loans to approved firms and corporations, such loans in all cases to be made under proper safeguards and to be based on securities that are adequate to guarantee repayment of principal and interest in full. Provided, that such loans shall be limited to providing funds for working capital.

In my trips through the industrial sections of Indiana during the summer and fall and in my talks with leaders of the business world I have become deeply impressed with the belief that there is now need of a sound policy to assist in the rehabilitation of the business structure of the United States, so that business and industry, which are eager to forge ahead, may be provided under some sound arrangement the necessary working capital to resume normal processes, which they are anxious to do at the earliest possible moment.

The National Recovery Administration has been a great boon in bringing about the establishment of fair practices and better working conditions, such as the spreading of employment by the shorter work week, the increased minimum wage, and the elimination of child labor, and now that there is every indication that these conditions are established on a permanent and lasting basis, the great need of the country is a return to normalcy in business and industry. In my opinion, there is no more important call to our statesmanship than this demand for a return to normal business and employment conditions.

The Civil Works Administration is filling an important need of the moment, but the prosperity it is bringing is at best ephemeral and synthetic and will fade away unless, meanwhile, we succeed in building on a more substantial and enduring industrial recovery basis, so that those who are now employed on civil works may be absorbed into normal business and industrial operations.

Everywhere I go among industrialists there is dinning into my ears the message that industry is starving for want of working capital. I refer now to the thousands upon thousands of good companies that are perfectly solvent but have no money to start productive enterprise. Many a company of this description has written to me:

If we could get money for working capital we would start operations and do our part to relieve unemployment, but we cannot borrow one cent.

The amendment which I propose would furnish that capital where loans could be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under conditions that would guarantee the return of every cent of the principal, as well as accumulated interest, to the United States Treasury. My proposal is simply that the Government shall loan its credit to start the wheels of industry in the United States. It is not pro-

posed to make a gift of one cent to any industry. I greatly prefer this plan to another suggestion that has been made that the Federal Government should advance Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds to banks as loans to industry with an agreement to assume 50 percent or some other percentage of loss in case loans prove to be noncollectible, but I believe the better way is to keep the Government out of any promise to assume any loss whatever. I do not believe that the assumption of any loss by the Government is necessary or advisable.

By making these capital loans to companies the Government would not be going into the banking business permanently. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a temporary institution, operating under a time limitation. All activities under it will cease when it goes out of business. A loan under proper safeguards of Reconstruction Finance funds to worthy companies as working capital to start productive enterprise will do more to rehabilitate the business structure of the United States than anything else that could happen, and if, with that accomplished, we will put into effect a strict policy of economy and reduce governmental indebtedness and tax rates to the limit, the sun of prosperity will shine on this country as it has not shone for many a year.

PRINTING OF ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President which was delivered on yesterday be ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

There was no objection.

SOLVING THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, the papers of late carry news of a "6-point program of independence for the Philippines" intended to "furnish a fair and equitable" solution of the Philippine question. I quote hereunder the Associated Press dispatch emanating from New York:

NEW YORK, January 1.—A 6-point program of independence for the Philippines was recommended to President Roosevelt today by a committee sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation.

Designed to "furnish a fair and equitable arrangement" satisfactory to both the United States and its insular possession, the program calls for:

1. The Philippines at once should be given a system of responsible government, subject to certain restricted rights of intervention by an American governor general.

2. While enjoying this status, the islands should have the right to conclude certain treaties and be represented at international conferences.

3. The period of responsible government should terminate at the end of the 10 years, subject to the conclusion of an international neutralization agreement.

4. The United States should surrender all naval bases in the Philippines to take effect upon neutralization and independence. A Philippine neutralization agreement should be negotiated as part of a settlement of larger Pacific issues at the naval conference to be held in 1935 or later.

5. The United States and the Philippines should conclude a 15-year reciprocal agreement providing for moderate duties and for quotas on imports from each country into the other.

6. Filipino immigration into the United States after independence should be placed under the quota, or regulated by a reciprocal immigration agreement.

To provide a "statesmanlike solution of the problem", the committee said, "the initiative of the President is highly desirable."

The committee—which includes in its membership Roy W. Howard, publisher, and Glenn Frank, president of the University of Wisconsin—raised serious objections to the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act passed by Congress and rejected by the Philippine Legislature.

The Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, the committee sets forth, "is designed primarily to protect certain American interests rather than to achieve genuine independence for the Philippines."

All should agree on the necessity of a statesmanlike solution of the Philippine problem acceptable to the peoples and Governments of the United States and the Philippines.

The points embodied in the program deserve careful consideration and dispassionate analysis. I desire to take them up seriatim.

1. The first point in the program reminds me of what was more or less favored by Mr. Quezon when he was in Washington in 1931, in the course of his conversations with Secretary Stimson and Secretary Hurley. At that time, Mr. Quezon used to say "Anything is better than the present situation." He was then giving expression to his dissatisfaction with the operation of the Jones Act, the present organic law of the Philippines. At that time Mr. Quezon was in favor of what he called "a responsible cabinet", which did not necessitate congressional legislation but would have been met by a mere administrative concession.

The idea of a responsible Government subject to certain restricted rights of intervention by an American governor general is not as favorable to the Philippines as the concession granted by the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law approved by Congress by which the Filipino people are authorized to approve a constitution and institute a government for the Philippine Commonwealth without an American governor general but with an elective Filipino chief executive, the Government of the United States to be represented by an American high commissioner whose powers, according to President Hoover's veto message, were too limited and inconsequential.

2. The second point in the foregoing program is rather ambiguous. It does not exactly state the treaties that may be concluded, the machinery and process of effecting them, the countries which would be affected, or the status of the representatives at international conferences. It is well at this juncture to point that section 2, subsection (j) of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law provides as follows:

Foreign affairs shall be under the direct supervision and control of the United States.

When it is borne in mind that the phraseology of the provision above quoted is different from the original language used in another bill providing that "foreign affairs shall be exclusively under the control of the United States", it is clear that if the congressional enactment had been accepted and put into operation, the Filipinos would have been given a voice and participation in foreign affairs during the 10 years' life of the Commonwealth government, for, if the Filipinos have no voice or participation in their foreign affairs while enjoying a Commonwealth status, what is there for the United States to supervise?

3. Under the third point of the foregoing program, the Philippines is not as sure as to the date of the grant of independence as it is under section 10 of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law. Based upon the interpretation of President Hoover at the time, under the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law, Philippine independence would come automatically on the 4th day of July immediately following the expiration of the 10-year period. Such was the interpretation of Messrs. Hawes, Cutting, Hare, and others who actively participated in the passage of the independence act.

Under the new proposal the grant of independence or the termination of the "period of responsible government" in the Philippines is conditioned by "the conclusion of an international neutralization agreement" which means that it would be contingent not only upon the will of the Government and people of the United States but upon the willingness or unwillingness of foreign powers to conclude a treaty of neutralization. It should be added that section 11 of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law provides specifically for the President of the United States negotiating with foreign powers with a view to the conclusion of a treaty of neutralization for the Philippines.

4. A glance at the fourth point in the foregoing program shows that under the scheme proposed independence is far more uncertain in its grant than under the Independence Act because it involves a settlement of larger Pacific issues. What those issues are no one can tell, and they may be known but not necessarily settled at the naval conference to be held in 1935 or later, and I wish to call particular

attention to the phrase "or later" to emphasize the uncertainty.

Under the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law the United States would surrender the base in the Philippines upon neutralization and dependence of the Philippines, for it is generally accepted in Washington that a neutralization treaty and the holding of bases cannot coexist. Either America would have bases without neutralization or there would be neutralization and independence without bases.

5. It is extremely doubtful if the fifth point translated into a law subject to the conflicting interests represented in Congress would be as favorable for the Philippines as the economic provisions of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act provided in section 6, wherein there is a straight limitation for the first 5 years and a graduated export tax for the second period of 5 years, the money derived therefrom to accrue to the coffers of the Philippine Government. The present trend for the fixing of quotas on imports to the United States from without is all in the direction of lessening rather than increasing such quotas.

The new scheme is likewise indefinite, for it does not specifically say in figures what the moderate duties may be.

Then, there is the suggestion of a 15-year period which savors so much of the well-known campaign against granting Philippine independence in less than 15 years at the time the Philippine measure was pending for consideration in the Seventy-second Congress. I can say authoritatively after my recent visit to the islands that the independence groups in the Philippines would strenuously oppose anything that smacks of a 15-year period. The Quezon group that killed and buried the independence act utilized the 10-year period in the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law as an argument, deeming it too long, although Mr. Quezon himself wrote Senator Hawes and others in Washington in 1931 asking that the 5-year period be changed to a 10-year period.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that section 13, of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law, provides for a trade conference between the representatives of the Government of the United States on the one hand and the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands on the other, such conference to be held at least 1 year prior to the date fixed in this act for the independence of the Philippine Islands. At such a conference, if the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law were operative reciprocal agreement on moderate duties and quotas from each country may well be reached.

6. Apropos of the sixth point, attention should be called to the fact that the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law provides for Filipino immigration on a quota basis and that after independence, the immigration laws of the United States would apply to the Philippines. There is nothing in the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law that would have prevented "a reciprocal immigration agreement." Under that law and after independence, the Philippines would be empowered to enact immigration laws patterned after those of the United States and embodying provisions favorable to the Philippines and to comity with other nations of the world.

The new scheme or proposal by the Committee on the Philippines sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation but whose recommendations in no way involve the responsibility of the Foreign Policy Association or the World Peace Foundation does not settle the grant of independence to the Philippines at an early date and on a day fixed and certain. Any legislation that falls short of solving this fundamental point does not adequately solve American-Filipino relations. The acceptance of the Independence Act passed by the Seventy-second Congress with January 17, 1934, as the deadline time limit or the approval of a resolution in Congress extending the time limit in section 1 of the said act by 6 or 7 months would be a far better and more effective solution of the Philippine question.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. HUGHES, is detained at home by illness in his family. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted leave of absence until next Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING BUDGET ESTIMATE (H.DOC. NO. 143)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

MESSAGE TRANSMITTING THE BUDGET

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Budget for the year ending June 30, 1935. It contains also estimates of receipts and expenditures for the current year ending June 30, 1934, and includes statements of the financial operations or status of all governmental agencies, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The estimates herein given and included in the Budget have to do with general and special funds—the Government's moneys. They do not relate to trust and contributed funds, which are not Government moneys, except where expressly referred to as such.

GENERAL FINANCIAL POSITION

In my annual message to the Congress I have already summarized the problems presented by the deflationary forces of the depression, the paralyzed condition which affected the banking system, business, agriculture, transportation, and, indeed, the whole orderly continuation of the Nation's social and economic system.

I have outlined the steps taken since last March for the resumption of normal activities and the restoration of the credit of the Government.

Of necessity these many measures have caused spending by the Government far in excess of the income of the Government.

The results of expenditures already made show themselves in concrete form in better prices for farm commodities, in renewed business activity, in increased employment, in reopening of and restored confidence in banks, and in well-organized relief.

THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR (Ending June 30, 1934)

Exclusive of debt retirement of \$488,171,500 for this year, Budget estimates of expenditures, including operating expenses of the regular Government establishments and also all expenditures which may be broadly classed as caused by the necessity for recovery from the depression will amount this year (ending June 30, 1934) to \$9,403,006,967. (See Budget Statement No. 3, table A.)

This total falls in broad terms into the following classifications:

Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1934

General:	
Departmental	\$2, 899, 116, 200
Legislative	17, 718, 500
Independent establishments	616, 857, 067
	<hr/>
	3, 533, 691, 767
Less public-debt retirements	488, 171, 500
	<hr/>
Total, general	3, 045, 520, 267
Emergency:	
Public Works Administration	1, 677, 190, 800
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	103, 250, 000
Farm Credit Administration	40, 000, 000
Emergency Conservation Work	341, 705, 600
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3, 969, 740, 300
Tennessee Valley Authority	19, 000, 000
Federal land banks	52, 350, 000
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	150, 000, 000
National Industrial Recovery Administration	4, 250, 000
	<hr/>
Total, emergency	6, 357, 486, 700
	<hr/>
Total, general and emergency, less public-debt retirements	9, 403, 006, 967

As against these expenditures, which have either been appropriated for or for which appropriations are asked, the

estimated receipts for this fiscal year (ending June 30, 1934) are \$3,259,938,756. (See Budget Statement No. 2, table A.)

On this basis, including, however, certain additional expenditures for 1934 which are not included in the Budget estimates but which I believe to be necessary and amounting to \$1,166,000,000 as shown in a subsequent table herein, the excess of expenditures over receipts will be \$7,309,068,211. Interest charges on the borrowings in excess of Budget estimates will slightly increase this figure.

On the basis of these estimates, the public debt, in the strict sense of the term, at the expiration of this fiscal year will therefore amount to approximately \$29,847,000,000, or an increase as shown above of \$7,309,068,211.

However, as against this increase in the total debt figure, it is right to point out that the various governmental agencies have loans outstanding with a book value of \$3,558,516,189 against which collateral or assets have been pledged.

In order to make clear to the Congress what our borrowing problem is for the next 6 months, permit me to remind you that we shall have to borrow approximately \$6,000,000,000 of new money and, in addition, \$4,000,000,000 to meet maturities of a like amount.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1935
(Ending June 30, 1935)

The Budget estimates of expenditures, exclusive of debt retirement of \$525,763,800 and exclusive also of such sum as may be necessary for new and extraordinary recovery purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, amount to \$3,960,798,700.

Again summarizing the main headings of these expenditures, they fall into the following items:

Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1935

General:	
Departmental.....	\$3,202,074,900
Legislative.....	18,734,500
Independent establishments.....	542,466,600
	3,763,276,000
Less public-debt retirements.....	525,763,800
Total, general.....	3,237,512,200
Emergency:	
Public Works Administration.....	1,089,883,100
Agricultural Adjustment Administration.....	5,000,000
Emergency conservation work.....	65,190,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	480,436,600
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	31,000,000
Federal land banks.....	12,650,000
Total, emergency.....	723,286,500
Total, general and emergency, less public-debt retirements.....	3,960,798,700

It will be noted that many of these items such as public works fall under appropriations made in 1933, the actual expenditures not taking place until after June 30, 1934. (For details of above expenditures see Budget Statement No. 3, table A.)

The above figures do not include additional loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If its loaning authority is extended beyond June 30, 1934, it is contemplated that any additional loans by it would thereafter be taken from the new and additional recovery fund hereinafter referred to.

The estimates of receipts for the next fiscal year (ending June 30, 1935), exclusive of foreign-debt payments, of increased liquor taxes, and of increased revenue flowing from amendments to the existing revenue law, amount to \$3,974,665,479. (See Budget Statement No. 2, table A.)

Therefore, exclusive of debt retirement, these Budget estimates for the next fiscal year show a small surplus of \$13,866,779. But it must be borne in mind that this surplus does not include any additional expenditures for extraordinary recovery purposes.

It is clear that the necessity for relief and recovery will still be with us during the year 1934-35. Additional relief funds will be necessary. Further needs of the country prohibit the abrupt termination of the recovery program. No

¹ Excess of credits—deduct.

person can on this date definitely predict the total amount that will be needed, nor the itemizing of such an amount. It is my best judgment at this time that a total appropriation of not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 will, with the expenditures still to be made next year out of existing appropriations, be sufficient.

I shall therefore ask the Congress for appropriations approximating that amount.

This amount is not included in the Budget estimates. If appropriated and expended, therefore, it will change the small estimated surplus of \$13,000,000 into a debt increase of nearly \$2,000,000,000. It is only fair, of course, to say that such a debt increase would be partially offset by loans made against collateral and assets pledged.

Therefore, the total debt, if increased by the sum of \$2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1935, would amount to approximately \$31,834,000,000 on June 30, 1935. It is my belief that so far as we can make estimates with our present knowledge, the Government should seek to hold the total debt within this amount. Furthermore, the Government during the balance of this calendar year should plan to bring its 1936 expenditures, including recovery and relief, within the revenues expected in the fiscal year 1936.

Let me put it another way: The excess of expenditures over receipts during this fiscal year amounts to over \$7,000,000,000. My estimates for the coming fiscal year show an excess of expenditures over receipts of \$2,000,000,000. We should plan to have a definitely balanced Budget for the third year of recovery and from that time on seek a continuing reduction of the national debt.

This excess of expenditures over revenues amounting to over \$9,000,000,000 during 2 fiscal years has been rendered necessary to bring the country to a sound condition after the unexampled crisis which we encountered last spring. It is a large amount, but the immeasurable benefits justify the cost.

The following table shows expenditures and receipts for the fiscal years 1934 and 1935 as contained in the Budget, plus the additional expenditures which will be made out of additional authorizations and appropriations here recommended. It shows, also, the estimated increase in the public debt and the book value of assets held as security against loans:

	1934	1935	2-year period 1934-35
Receipts ¹	\$3,259,938,756	\$3,974,665,479	\$7,234,604,235
Expenditures (exclusive of debt retirement):			
General.....	2,530,720,267	2,486,768,200	5,017,488,467
Agricultural Adjustment Administration.....	514,800,000	750,744,000	1,265,544,000
Emergency ²	6,357,486,700	723,286,500	7,080,773,200
	9,403,006,967	3,960,798,700	13,363,805,667
Additional expenditures from additional appropriations.....	1,166,000,000	2,000,000,000	3,166,000,000
Total expenditures.....	10,569,006,967	5,960,798,700	16,529,805,667
Increase in debt ³	7,309,068,211	1,986,133,221	9,295,201,432
Estimated book value of assets held as security for loans.....			5,461,962,273

¹ These estimates of receipts are predicated on Federal Reserve Board average index of industrial production of 81 for fiscal year 1934 and of 98 for the fiscal year 1935.

	Calendar year average	Fiscal year average
1929.....	119	118
1930.....	96	110
1931.....	81	87
1932.....	64	70
1933.....	^a 76	^a 67
1934.....	^b 85	^b 81
1935.....		^b 98

^a Partially estimated.

^b Estimated.

² These include net expenditures after deducting Reconstruction Finance Corporation repayments in 1935 of \$480,436,600.

³ This figure does not include contingent liabilities such as Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures issued to banks and other institutions.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Budget estimates of appropriations for 1935, exclusive of Agricultural Adjustment Administration benefit payments and refunds of processing taxes, but inclusive of all other appropriations for regular departments and independent establishments including interest on the debt and debt retirement, are \$2,980,293,833.60. When compared with Budget estimates of appropriations transmitted in the Budget for 1934, they show a reduction of \$684,913,167.

A tabular comparative summary of receipts, estimates, appropriations, and expenditures, classified according to general and emergency items and listed by departments and under other general heads, appears in Budget Statement No. 1, table B.

TAXES

The estimates of receipts take no account of the additional revenue which may be obtained from an increase in liquor taxes and from the proposed changes in the income tax law. Since neither of these tax measures has come before Congress as yet, no accurate estimate can be made of their yield. However, if, as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax on distilled spirits is increased from \$1.10 a gallon to \$2 a gallon, and the rates of tax on wines are also increased, the estimated revenue would be increased by approximately \$50,000,000, assuming that consumption is not affected by additional gallonage taxes imposed by the States. Considerable additional revenue can also be secured from administrative changes in the income tax law, which may amount to as much as \$150,000,000 for a full year.

The estimates for the Post Office Department are predicated upon a continuation of the 3-cent postal rate for non-local mail. It is highly important that this rate be continued. I recommend its continuance.

ECONOMY LEGISLATION

The estimates of appropriations submitted in the Budget are predicated on the continuation of certain economy legislative provisions, which I ask to be enacted and which are appended hereto. The most important is that having to do with reduction of compensation of Federal employees. It is eminently fair that, the cost of living having fallen as compared with 1928, the employees of the Government sustain some reduction in compensation. This is not inconsistent with our policy of advocating an increase in wages in industry. For wages there had fallen far beyond any reduction contemplated for Federal employees and in most grades are even now substantially below compensation paid Federal employees under the maximum reduction of 15 percent.

Among the legislative provisions appended hereto is one prohibiting automatic increases in compensation except in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The personnel of these three services are engaged in a life service to their country. Some, by reason of the pay freezes, have sustained reduction in compensation of more than 25 percent. They are, therefore, in a different category from those in other governmental agencies. They should, in 1935, be released from the restrictions on automatic increases in compensation.

CONTROL

Up to now there has been no coordinated control over emergency expenditures. Today, by Executive order, I have imposed that necessary control in the Bureau of the Budget.

Heretofore emergency expenditures have not been subject to audit by the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office. Today I am, by Executive order, reposing in him the authority to conduct such an audit and to continue to audit each such expenditure. Hereafter, therefore, just as in the departmental expenditures, there will be, in emergency expenditures, a pre-Budget and a post-audit.

By reason of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has had no control in the past over the various expenditures, obligations, and allotments made by the emergency organizations, the task of preparing the present Budget has been the most difficult one since the Budget and Accounting Act went into effect in 1921. These difficulties in future years

will be substantially minimized by the control which I have established.

It is evident to me, as I am sure it is evident to you, that powerful forces for recovery exist. It is by laying a foundation of confidence in the present and faith in the future that the upturn which we have so far seen will become cumulative. The cornerstone of this foundation is the good credit of the Government.

It is, therefore, not strange nor is it academic that this credit has a profound effect upon the confidence so necessary to permit the new recovery to develop into maturity.

If we maintain the course I have outlined, we can confidently look forward to cumulative beneficial forces represented by increased volume of business, more general profit, greater employment, a diminution of relief expenditures, larger governmental receipts and repayments, and greater human happiness.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 3, 1934.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress, pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 2, 1933 (Public, 410, 72d Cong.), an alternate arrangement of the estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1935.

The details of this alternate arrangement of the estimates are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which is transmitted herewith, and with which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, January 3, 1934.

LIQUOR TAXING ACT OF 1934

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6131) to raise revenue by taxing certain intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes; and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that there may be 4 hours of general debate, one half of which to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and one half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6131, and, pending that, asks unanimous consent that there be 4 hours of general debate, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the Chairman of the Committee, who has control of the 2 hours on this side of the House, to divide that between those supporting the bill and those in opposition?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I desire to amend the unanimous-consent request by stating that the debate be confined to the bill; that there be 4 hours of general debate, equally divided, and that the debate shall be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, as amended?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, of course, the gentleman knows that there is some opposition to the bill on this side of the House, and we who have different ideas about the subject would like to be assured of sufficient time within which to debate it.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is naturally assumed that there might be some differences of opinion as to certain rates and provisions of the bill, but I, as chairman of

the committee, was not aware of the fact that there was any opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, coming right down to the point, the only concrete question in it is the amount of tax on whisky. That is the big item. If there is a difference of opinion on that, the opposition on this side ought to have a fair proportion of the 2 hours in which to present their views.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I can assure the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] that as far as I am concerned I shall be disposed to deal fairly with those who have different views with respect to the bill; and if we do not have sufficient time to do anything more than conclude the general debate today, perhaps we can extend the time by unanimous consent. I shall endeavor to be fair, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I appreciate that, but this is the first bill that comes before this session of the Congress, and it has been the practice heretofore, when time is allotted, either under a rule or under unanimous consent, that that time on each side of the House be evenly divided between the proponents and the opponents. Now, let us start right. Whenever there is 1 hour or 2 hours on a side, if there is opposition, that time should be equally divided by those in control.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. In response to that statement, I may say that there might be a half dozen different factions, Members who would have different views with reference to certain provisions of a bill. If that should be true, I would not know how to equitably divide the time.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. It is obvious that the only controversial question of any importance is the question of rates. The gentleman can readily appreciate the fact that there might be as many different views as to what the rate should be as there are Members present. In its final analysis, the question of rate is of necessity a matter of compromise.

Assuming there is no pronounced opposition to the bill, certainly we can thrash out the questions as to the rate without any extended discussion of this particular phase.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not agree with the gentleman on that. The committee took many days to thrash out this question of rates, and it is not yet thrashed out to the satisfaction of a great number of people. The opposition should get an opportunity. May I ask the chairman of the committee if of his 2 hours he will yield me one half an hour?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree to that. Half a dozen Members might make the same request. Unless we had 2 or 3 days of general debate, I cannot see how I can assure anyone that he will get 30 minutes out of 2 hours' time on this subject. I will assure the gentleman, however—and if this be not satisfactory, I shall move that the debate be limited to 4 hours—but I shall assure the gentleman that, so far as it within my power lies, I shall be disposed to deal eminently and absolutely fairly with him on the subject.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I appreciate that, but I have heard similar statements so often. It is just as simple to say right now how much time the gentleman is going to give me as it will be at the end of a couple of hours, or after an opportunity to confer about it.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. A good deal depends on the other requests.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know. I have heard that statement very often.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. And the gentleman is liable to hear it many more times under similar circumstances.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call attention to House File No. 1, now on the Speaker's desk for signature; that is, a petition to bring the bill before the House.

We now have the signatures of more than 50 Congressmen. We need 145 to bring the bill before the House.

The adjusted-service certificate bill provides for the payment of the adjusted-service certificates in currency, providing for controlled expansion of the currency, and is frequently referred to as the bonus bill. I ask that Members of the House sign the petition in order that speedy compensation payment may be made to our service men of the World War. The cruel, vicious, and inhuman so-called "economy law" has brought poverty and destitution to the homes and firesides of hundreds of thousands of men who served in 1917 and 1918. This makes the payment of these certificates more necessary now than ever. Our service men, their widows and orphans first, gentlemen.

Payment of the soldiers' bonus means more than \$53,-099,000 for my own State of Minnesota, according to figures compiled and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 18, 1932. By counties in Minnesota this means that the following amounts will be paid:

MINNESOTA

Aitkin	\$310,836.39
Anoka	381,374.65
Becker	466,037.13
Beltrami	428,841.97
Benton	311,809.76
Big Stone	203,744.98
Blue Earth	700,971.37
Brown	485,193.88
Carlton	439,714.72
Carver	350,744.56
Cass	322,889.61
Chippewa	326,431.02
Chisago	273,144.19
Clay	478,815.20
Clearwater	197,697.66
Cook	50,428.85
Cottonwood	306,135.22
Crow Wing	530,735.17
Dakota	716,400.32
Dodge	251,150.17
Douglas	369,617.23
Faribault	448,205.82
Fillmore	512,531.08
Freeborn	595,226.11
Goodhue	648,575.07
Grant	197,946.18
Hennepin	10,723,327.35
Houston	286,729.95
Hubbard	198,733.16
Isanti	250,197.51
Itasca	563,809.04
Jackson	328,522.73
Kanabec	177,236.18
Kandiyohi	488,217.54
Kittson	200,638.48
Koochiching	291,555.38
Lac qui Parle	318,892.58
Lake	146,378.28
Lake of the Woods	86,857.74
Le Sueur	372,572.90
Lincoln	234,085.13
Lyon	400,241.46
McLeod	425,010.62
Mahnomen	127,428.63
Marshall	352,132.13
Martin	463,924.71
Meeker	370,998.94
Mille Lacs	291,513.96
Morrison	526,903.82
Mower	581,226.15
Murray	287,910.42
Nicollet	342,750.50
Nobles	385,578.78
Norman	291,203.31
Olmsted	733,672.46
Otter Tail	1,056,334.26
Pennington	217,185.77
Pine	419,667.44
Pipestone	253,448.98
Polk	745,953.49
Pope	270,990.35
Ramsey	5,937,991.91
Red Lake	142,629.77
Redwood	427,040.20
Renville	489,687.95
Rice	620,761.54
Rock	227,023.02
Roseau	261,380.91
St. Louis	4,237,183.16
Scott	292,342.36
Sherburne	201,073.39
Sibley	328,564.15
Stearns	1,286,525.91
Steele	382,617.25

MINNESOTA—continued

Stevens.....	\$210,931.35
Swift.....	305,161.85
Todd.....	541,980.70
Traverse.....	164,395.98
Wabasha.....	364,765.23
Wadena.....	227,602.90
Waseca.....	298,472.52
Washington.....	512,634.63
Watsonwan.....	265,129.42
Wilkin.....	202,771.61
Winona.....	727,832.24
Wright.....	561,634.49
Yellow Medicine.....	344,303.75
Total.....	53,099,466.63

For Minneapolis and the Third Congressional District of Minnesota it means that the following amounts will be paid:

Hennepin County.....	\$10,723,327.35
Anoka County.....	381,374.65
Chisago County.....	273,144.19
Isanti County.....	250,197.51
Washington County.....	512,634.63
Total.....	12,140,678.33

According to the figures quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 10, 1931, this means that 83,049 veterans in Minnesota will receive immediate cash payments.

Why not pay the soldiers' certificates in currency now? The money so distributed will fall like a gentle rain on the parched countryside, and will do more to restore prosperity at this moment than any act proposed by the administration.

MR. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

MR. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Louisiana election-contest case has been passed over until Monday. The floor leader made the statement this morning that he is not particularly interested in this bill being completed before Saturday. In view of the number of Members who have expressed an interest in the discussion of this bill, would it not be better to agree to a longer time for general debate?

MR. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], with whom there was a tentative understanding, it is perfectly satisfactory to me to extend the time to 5 hours.

MR. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the chairman of the committee that, so far as the minority is concerned, if, in order to accommodate his colleagues, he desires to extend the time further, it is entirely agreeable to us. The time as allotted, 2 hours, so far as my present requests are concerned, will take care of the minority.

Now, if the gentleman considers there is occasion to use more time in general debate, as long as it is divided in the same way as the 4 hours, it will be entirely satisfactory to me.

MR. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that the chairman of the committee made the statement on the floor yesterday that the Government is losing revenue at the rate of three quarters of a million dollars a day; or, at least, it is losing a very large amount of money. If this be true, why can we not expedite the passage of this bill and all of us withhold at least a part of our ammunition?

MR. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as I remember it, the loss to the Government is about \$416 per minute of this debate.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that 5 hours be consumed in general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6131) to raise revenue by taxing

certain intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes, with Mr. BANKHEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 6131, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is designed to increase substantially the revenues of the Government by imposing or adjusting taxes on certain alcoholic beverages the consumption of which is made legal in many States of the Union by the twenty-first amendment.

This bill is primarily a tax bill dealing with the rates of taxes to be imposed upon certain alcoholic beverages.

While there will doubtless be subsequent legislation necessary with respect to the different phases of the liquor subject, your committee was of the opinion that on account of the serious need of additional revenues caused by our present economic condition it was essential to expedite the passage of this legislation as much as is practicable.

The paramount thought in my mind in connection with the enactment of this legislation is—and it was the thought of the Committee on Ways and Means—that it is essential that the taxes to be imposed on alcoholic beverages should not be too high in order that those who are engaged in the traffic or business legally may not be put out of business or have unfair competition by those who engage in the business illegally.

Joint hearings were conducted for 4 days by the committee from the Senate and the House Committee on Ways and Means. The joint committee had before it the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation dealing with the subject covering many pages. This committee was composed of representatives of several departments of the Government which, no doubt, had made thorough study of the subject. Also witnesses appeared before the committee representing different interests connected with this bill. While some were in favor of much higher taxes than are carried in the bill and some in favor of very much lower taxes than that proposed in the report of the interdepartmental committee, that committee recommended a rate of \$2.60 per gallon. Their recommendation, however, was made on the theory that a portion of the tax collected would be distributed or allocated to the various States. After giving diligent consideration to this subject, your committee were of the opinion that too many administrative difficulties were involved in the Federal Government collecting all the taxes and attempting to allocate or distribute a portion of the money to the various States. Therefore, after full consideration and discussion, the committee decided to impose only such tax as we thought the Federal Government alone would be justified in imposing.

Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill deal with rates on distilled spirits in various forms. The important change is that which imposes a tax of \$2 per gallon in lieu of \$1.10 in the present law.

This is fully set out in the committee report and the Members can find it very readily.

This rate applies to whisky, gin, brandy, rum, and similar liquors, but not denatured alcohol for industrial purposes. That is left tax free.

Sections 6, 7, and 8 provide for new rates of tax on wines, liqueurs, cordials, and grape brandy used in the fortification thereof. The rate of tax on wine with an alcoholic content of 10 percent and not over 14 percent is 10 cents a gallon; between 14 and 21 percent, 20 cents per gallon; between 21 and 24 percent, 40 cents per gallon; and above that there is the same rate of tax as carried on alcoholic liquors, namely, \$2 per gallon.

MR. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

MR. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Was it brought out in committee what it cost to manufacture a gallon of liquor?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There were various statements made on that subject, but I do not believe there was any general agreement. It would depend, of course, upon the cost of the materials and the price of labor. There was considerable evidence, but nothing definitely agreed upon as to what would be the cost of manufacturing a gallon of liquor.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand it costs 50 cents to manufacture a gallon. There is a tax of \$1.10. That is a total of \$1.60. And they charge \$24 a gallon. If that is not racketeering, I do not know what is.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The purpose of holding hearings on this matter during vacation, and in introducing the bill on the first day and bringing the bill before the Committee of the Whole House for debate on the second day and passing it on the third day of this session, tomorrow, was to get the tax money in the Treasury as soon as possible, was it not?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. There is other tax money that ought to be in the Treasury now. I have in my hand a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to reaching the tax evaders and removing the exemption on tax-exempt securities, but there is no recommendation made by the subcommittee, and there has been no bill introduced by the subcommittee, that does away with tax-exempt securities. We all have confidence in the gentleman from North Carolina, and we all highly commend him for the splendid work he has done in the last Congress, as well as other Congresses, but I was just wondering what we may expect from the gentleman's committee at an early date in the way of legislation that does away with these tax-exempt securities, which permit multimillionaires over all the United States to escape payment of taxes they justly owe to this Government.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Of course, the gentleman from Texas understands that there are obstacles of a constitutional nature in the way of removing the exemption on securities.

Mr. BLANTON. With respect to the securities themselves, of course, there is a constitutional obstacle in the way, but that can be gotten out of the way just as expeditiously as was the eighteenth amendment; but I am speaking just now of the income from these tax-exempt securities. We do not need any constitutional amendment to get away from such exemptions, and I want the gentleman to direct his explanation to that question.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The Congress, of course, has the power as to Federal securities to say that they shall be subject to either normal taxes or surtaxes. We have certain securities that are subject to surtaxes, and the question of whether we should extend that provision to future issues is a question that affected the operations of the Treasury Department in securing the further credits necessary to meet the emergency situation now confronting us, and we are awaiting recommendations from the Treasury Department and conferences with that Department before taking further action.

Mr. BLANTON. If the chairman will permit the observation, I believe the gentleman recognizes the fact that it is the sentiment of this House, including practically every Member on the floor, that something ought to be done right away on this question. I believe if we had up now a resolution proposing such a constitutional amendment we could pass it in almost 15 minutes, and any legislation that would seek to reach the income from such securities, I believe, could be passed by this House by an almost unanimous vote.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The Committee on Ways and Means has not yet drafted the bill for a general revision of the administrative provisions of the revenue act—

Mr. BLANTON. But we may expect that soon?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. You may expect a bill dealing with those subjects and we will be guided by the situation as presented to us by the Treasury Department and by our own judgment as to whether we will present this question of surtaxes on future issues of Government securities.

Mr. BLANTON. That is going to bring hope to the tax-burdened people of the United States who pay their taxes to the Government.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think this is all out of place to a very large extent. We are considering a tax on liquor, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is endeavoring to call attention to some methods of escaping taxation that are quite public. Of course, we know about them, but the next income-tax reports are not due to be made until next March. This committee has been working very strenuously and very hard, and we cannot do but one thing at a time. It is important to pass this bill now, while the subject matter that the gentleman from Texas brings up has to do with income taxes, on which reports are to be made as of March 15.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, not all of these tax evaders live in Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we all appreciate and admire the ability of the very diligent gentleman from Texas, who is always on guard in behalf of the interests of the Treasury and the public, but unanimous consent was given by the House with the understanding that the debate this morning would be confined to the pending bill. We are getting into a prolonged debate here upon an irrelevant matter, and I hope that such questions may be held in abeyance until a later hour, and I can assure the gentleman from Texas that the matter in which he is interested will receive proper attention by the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I have found out all I wanted to know.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Section 9 of the bill deals with rates on fermented malt liquors, beer, ale, porter, and so forth. Under existing law, approved at the last session of the Congress, the rate on beer having an alcoholic content above 3.2 percent was fixed at \$6 per barrel, and beer 3.2 percent at \$5 per barrel.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Was any consideration given to the proposition of having the rate at \$5 or lower on beer of 3.2 percent and increasing the amount of the tax on beer of above 3.2 percent?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Under the present law beer above 3.2 carries a rate of \$6 per barrel, while 3.2 percent beer is taxed \$5. This bill provides one flat rate of \$5 per barrel.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, there is nothing in this bill, except fixing the tax, and there is nothing in the bill so far as the future policy of the Federal Government is concerned?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. SNELL. Does the committee have in mind bringing in a bill in the near future with respect to the policy of the Government with respect to such matters?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We certainly have that in mind, and will doubtless do so at the proper time. The revenue bill is one of the things that will receive early attention and will be brought up very soon. I will not say immediately, but it will receive early attention.

Mr. TREADWAY. If the chairman of the committee will yield, is not an answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York somewhat involved in whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over the gen-

eral subject matter of the policy of the administration in such matters? I know that question came up.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I know there will be certain matters over which the Ways and Means Committee will have jurisdiction and which it will be necessary to take up, but, perhaps, not all matters relating to the liquor question. Some of those matters may come from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Section 10 provides for a floor tax, so that all intoxicating liquors which have been taxed at existing rates will be subject to an additional tax in the hands of the manufacturer or dealer equal to the difference between the new rate and the old.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Subsection (b) of section 9 repeals the tax on nonintoxicating liquors, which includes fruit juices.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Fruit juices with less than one half of 1 percent alcoholic content ought not to be taxed.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Most of these are used for making wine.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Wine carrying a content of alcohol above one half of 1 percent is taxed by this bill.

Now, I should like to state in conclusion that it was the intent of the membership of the Ways and Means Committee to pass this bill as soon as possible. Every day that it is delayed the Treasury loses one half a million dollars. If after this legislation is enacted practical experience demonstrates that the taxes are too high or too low, the Congress can make any needed amendments.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it the intention of the gentleman to pass this bill today?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is not. It is our intention only to finish general debate. We are hopeful that we may be able to pass it tomorrow.

Mr. BRITTEN. It would seem desirable to pass it today if we are losing half a million dollars a day.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I do not think it is expected that a bill of this importance should necessarily be passed in 1 day.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is my impression that a great majority of the Members of the House will vote for the passage of this bill and do it as quickly as you will give them the opportunity.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I assure the gentleman that we will expedite the passage of the bill as much as possible.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. I should like to ask the gentleman if the members of the Ways and Means Committee were unanimous for the \$2 tax?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I will state that the majority members of the committee reached a unanimous agreement. We decided that the \$2 rate would be as nearly correct as we could determine.

So far as the minority members are concerned, and they can speak for themselves, they did not either agree or disagree. They left it open. I do not know the position of the minority members.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to the \$2 tax, I find, on page 330 of the hearings, a chart, no. 11, which was submitted by the interdepartmental committee, that the price to the retailer per gallon of legal spirits is \$1.20, that the price to the local bootlegger per gallon is \$2.20, \$1 more, and that the price to the organized syndicated illegal trade—that is, the organized syndicate, where they must pay more

for protection—is \$4.20. If you superimpose on the legal cost of \$1.20 a gallon to the retailer a tax of \$2 a gallon, you make the price to the retailer \$3.20 per gallon of legal liquor. This does not take into consideration the State and municipal taxes. If that is so, if you leave it at the \$2 rate, how is the legal operator going to compete with the local bootlegger where the cost to latter will be only \$2.20?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The premise is not conceded. That is an opinion.

Mr. CELLER. These are figures put into the record by the experts.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There are all kinds of experts and all kinds of figures. There is no certainty that these figures are correct.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] should bear in mind that the hearings show, by all those who appeared before the committee in a position to give information on the subject, that your illicit liquor traffic is divided into two groups. One is the so-called "old-fashioned moonshiner", who operates in a local community or in a given section. The experts gave the committee testimony to the effect that that was of negligible consequence, so far as the liquor traffic is concerned. That is the group of the illicit traffic to which the first figures quoted by the gentleman from New York relate. The great organized group of the illicit traffic, the proof shows, has an operating expense of \$4.20 per gallon.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, with a \$2 tax the legal operator could compete against the organized syndicate, but he would still have considerable competition from the well-entrenched local bootlegger who could sell his wares more cheaply than the legal operator with the \$2 tax plus his State and municipal and occupational taxes and license fees.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. He would have some competition still, from a local standpoint, from the old-time moonshiner, who existed long before prohibition and who presumably may continue to exist, but that competition is confined to local communities, and the moonshiners are more or less local in their operations. The experts all testified that their effect on the liquor traffic is really negligible; that it is the great organized group that we have to contend with in the question of rate fixing.

Mr. CELLER. I find that in New York, for example, the legal operator is compelled to get two kinds of liquor. He gets his legal liquor from a rather limited supply, as there are small stocks on hand in this country, but in order to supply the demand he has to get illegal liquor, and he gets some of that from the great organized syndicate, but the most comes from the local bootlegger; and so I am inclined to doubt the conclusion of the committee that there is not so much of this local bootlegger stuff around in the various cities. There is very much in my city.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. In that connection you do not have much of the old-time moonshiner there?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. That is the point that I endeavored to make to the gentleman. The great bulk of this illicit traffic comes under the group that embraces the bootlegger and those who control the distribution of liquor, who buy it from some source, not producing it locally as the moonshiner does.

Mr. CELLER. But if we should reduce the tax to \$1.10, the old preprohibition level, we will be able to compete with all classes of illegal operators beyond question.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. I am wondering how the tax provided in this bill compares with the tax in other countries.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The tax is not as high as it is in other countries.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, in that connection the tax in England is \$14 a gallon, and in Canada \$7 a gallon, and until recently it was \$8.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We are legislating in the United States for the United States. With respect to the operations of the bootlegger and the illicit dealer, I am of opinion that the bootlegger is going to find a much more difficult road to travel in the future than he has in the recent past. In the first place, the Federal Government will go after him more aggressively and determinedly, in order to get its revenue. Then the licensed dealer, in order to protect his business, must make a fight upon him, and the States that impose a tax on liquor will necessarily be diligent in their effort toward the suppression of the bootlegger in order to protect their revenue. Between the three, the Federal Government, the licensed dealer, and the State governments, the illicit dealer, in my judgment, is going to find it unprofitable and hazardous to engage in that business. Moreover, when people desiring alcoholic liquor can purchase legal liquor many of them will not patronize the bootlegger. Public sentiment will condemn such purchases. The man who patronizes the illicit dealer would be robbing the Government, and few people desire to do this.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Having in mind the license fees to be paid by municipalities and the distillers' tax probably paid to the States, did the gentleman have any evidence before his committee of contemplated taxes per gallon by the States? And in view of that evidence, does the gentleman believe that that was the basis used in determining the price of \$2?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It was not, because we had no definite knowledge of what taxes the various States might impose, but we felt that the \$2 tax would leave room for a reasonable State tax. Of course, if the State imposes a tax too high, it will drive the business to another State or it will tend to encourage bootlegging.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman state to us what he would recommend as a satisfactory or reasonable tax to be imposed by a State in addition to this \$2?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The interdepartmental committee which made an examination and study of every phase of the matter recommended a total tax of \$2.60, 20 percent of which would go to the States. If the gentleman will take 20 percent of \$2.60, he will have the judgment of the interdepartmental committee, which is as sound as any opinion we are likely to get. The States can, in my opinion, levy a tax of 50 or 75 cents per gallon without going too high.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The Rockefeller Foundation report was \$3 total tax.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The Rockefeller Foundation report was \$3 total tax, yes; and I understand that was on the basis that the Federal Government would receive about \$2, and something approximating \$1 would be allocated to the various States. Of course, the Federal Government cannot decide what the States will do, but they will, in their judgment, keep in mind the fact that if they impose a tax too high it will be difficult to collect, and there will be less consumption of legal liquor, and they will receive less taxes than if we impose a reasonable tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. It seems the States will have to impose the levings, whatever they may be. The protests which come to me are that the tax is too high, for the reason that there is nothing left for the State, and at the present moment the desire to get rid of the bootlegger is a great deal greater than the amount of revenue concerned.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There are those on this floor who believe \$2 tax is too high. Others believe it is too low. There is no way of knowing what the future will determine about the matter, but the majority members

of our committee thought that \$2 was about the best levy that could be determined at present, and there was no particular opposition from the minority members of the committee. If experience shows it is too high, we can lower it; if it is too low, we can raise it.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. In further reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], we must all bear in mind that prior to prohibition, all gallonage tax was levied by the Federal Government. License fees and other taxes of that type were levied by States and local communities. In the pending legislation the same policy is sought to be followed as obtained prior to prohibition. That is, have the Federal Government levy the gallonage tax. And the report of the committee shows that the levying of license fees and taxes of that type is still left to the State and local governments.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it intended to impose any occupational tax at all?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Only a nominal rate that is now in existence; that is, simply for control or regulation purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Under the Commissioner of Internal Revenue?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Yes; it is not increased.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 29½ minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I either have the misfortune or the good fortune to represent the largest whisky district in the United States of America. I suppose it is something of a fortuity that I should represent a district that is at the present time producing approximately 16,000 cases of whisky per day. That means that I have a very definite interest in the economics of this bill, as well as the moral aspect which is designed to drive the bootlegger out of business.

As I think of this taxing bill and think of the sentiment that was rampant in the country when we were convened in the special session of the Seventy-third Congress, I think you will admit there was a general consciousness of the people of this country and among those who sit in official capacity in the States and municipalities to hang the entire burden of government upon whisky and beer. I am wondering, as a matter of fact, whether that sentiment has not been encouraged and possibly carried to a point where it might be dangerous. It recalls two boys who were out on a raft after a shipwreck: One was at the oars rowing and the other was on his knees praying. This boy who was on his knees supplicating the Almighty said, "O Lord, if we might but sight a sail, we give Thee anything we have. O Lord, if we might but see a ship on the horizon, we give Thee everything we hope to accumulate." Here was his companion at the oars rowing and looking around, and suddenly he saw a sail shimmering over on the horizon. He looked at his buddy and said, "Wait a minute. Don't promise too darned much. I think I see a ship."

That is exactly what is happening among National, State, and county taxing bodies. They defer everything in the hope of hanging it upon whisky and upon spirits generally, that they may then carry the burden of government.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I believe that \$2 is too high. It will be noted that the rectification tax of 30 cents a gallon remains in effect, so that for rectified whisky the United States tax will be \$2.30. This must be considered also in the light of licenses which have been imposed by ordinances of municipalities which seek also, directly and indirectly, to impose a tax upon the liquor business, whether it is retail or wholesale.

Recall also that there is a bill pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia which is going to impose a license fee of \$1,500 per year upon the vendor of spirits and beer.

Most of the States have gallonage taxes running from 25 cents to \$2 per gallon; and down here in the Department of Agriculture, under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, they have taken 75 cents per bushel as the base price of corn for processing into spirits. Whatever the difference is between the market price of corn in Chicago and the 75 cents is the additional processing tax the distiller has to flip into the Agricultural Adjustment processing fund. Municipalities also will impose license fees. So, what is the result? It is a tremendous debt structure that has been piled upon the whisky and beer business, all because they think there is a great deal of profiteering. Well, if there is profiteering at the present time, if they are getting exorbitant prices for whisky, good whisky and bad whisky alike, we still have the possibility of imposing some kind of excess-profits tax and taking all these exorbitant profits away from the brewers and manufacturers, if necessary.

What I am vitally concerned about is to put the bootlegger out of business and to keep him out of business. I wonder whether the Members of this House have a very finite conception of exactly how entrenched the bootleg business is in this country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] came to my district this summer and helped lay the cornerstone of the world's largest distillery. I rather fancy the gentleman from New York had an opportunity to visualize just exactly what goes on back there in Illinois. I can speak from direct and personal experiences with this bootleg business, because I have seen lots of bootleggers. A great many of them are my own friends; and I am not hypercritical or ashamed about it, because they vote just like anybody else. [Laughter.]

May I say to you that when Amos Woodcock was the Director of Prohibition—and everybody knows that he was an ardent dry—he made an estimate in connection with all the other experts in the Treasury Department to ascertain, if possible, and as nearly as possible, the amount of bootleg liquor that was being transported and sold and consumed in the United States of America. They traced, first of all, the available supplies of corn sugar, cane sugar, beet sugar, grain, blackstrap, and other things that can be converted into spirits. After segregating all that which had gone into legitimate industry they made their estimates. Here are their estimates of the bootleg liquor that was consumed in this country for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June 1930: From corn sugar, mind you, my friends, 45,900,000 proof gallons. Write that down in the book. From cane and beet sugar, 10,000,000 gallons; from grain, 4,000,000 gallons; from diverted industrial alcohol, which is precipitated and rerun, 9,929,000 gallons; from smuggled sources, 3,557,000 gallons. So we had in this country for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, 73,000,000 gallons of bootleg booze. And do not think for a minute that the men in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere, who go out and mangle themselves with riot guns, machine guns, and pistols; who made millions of dollars out of the booze racket; men who are typified by Al Capone—down in Atlanta—and others of these gangsters who have been hauled away in burnished silver caskets, no later than this summer in Chicago, are going to relinquish this thing without a struggle. How are we going to get at them? By piling up tremendous taxes? Certainly not. It will be by keeping the taxes down to the irreducible minimum. Let us make it possible for the distiller, the legitimate manufacturer, and the legitimate brewer to ultimately put him out of business.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has been lauding his distillers at Peoria.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I beg pardon. I have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has been talking about "legitimate" distillers. Does not the gentleman know that the bootleggers got most of their domestic supply from these very distillers he is talking about?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt it very much. I have heard the statement made time and time again, but it is just one of these wild conjectures so often and so loosely uttered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will yield further, he can find out that the national distillers, for instance, who bought out the Overholt Distillery from the Mellons, sold millions and millions of gallons to the bootlegger. The bootlegger was their biggest client. The distillers were not doing a legitimate business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be, but speaking for those who have been in the industrial alcohol business out in my district through the prohibition era, I may say that they were the very first to go to the Administrator in Chicago and complain whenever it came to their notice that there were illegal sources of supply in that particular area.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Are there not distilleries in Peoria who have been selling their wares all during prohibition? They have sold it by the millions of gallons. They have established credits for bootleggers as high as a million dollars in some instances. Did they think that was legitimate liquor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They had to qualify under the rules, regulations, and requirements of the Treasury Department and make the necessary affidavits. Is it their business to inquire into the ultimate destination of that which is legitimately sold?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield me an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman has referred to bootleg liquor to some extent. Does the gentleman regard this liquor as good liquor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What liquor?

Mr. KENNEY. The bootleg liquor to which he referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I regard that bootleg liquor as eminently superior to some of the junk we are drinking today.

Mr. KENNEY. If that be so, I ask the gentleman does he object to the legalization of the present supply of illicit liquor, so as to give the Government some revenue from the liquor that is being sold and consumed, whatever its quality may be, to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Government is never going to get a dime out of illicit liquor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand from my research into this subject that the bootleggers cut their liquor about six or seven times, and, as Dr. Wynne, the health commissioner of New York, said, no bootlegger ever had the heart to sell the stuff that your Peoria distillers and national distillers and Schenley distillers are now selling. I was in Peoria. I made a speech in Peoria in which I denounced the distiller to his face worse than I shall ever denounce him here, and while there one of your distillers gave me something which he said was whisky and asked me to taste it. I had a hard time getting past the smell, and finally I said to him, "My God, what is this?" He said, "That is 2 gallons of whisky and 48 gallons of alcohol to the barrel." There was one of your distillers cutting it 24 times, whereas the bootlegger only cuts in five or six times. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid that—shall I say the inexperienced taste of the gentleman from New York was not accustomed to the taste of good, midwestern whisky. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. In line with the discussion between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York, looking at it from a common-sense viewpoint for a moment, I assume there can be no doubt that the bootleggers now have the retail trade of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, judging from the number of bootleggers who operate in the House Office Building, I should say that is true. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Without entering into any phase of the matter of that type, they have the distribution facilities now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is partly true.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. With the distillers having the production facilities, let us just for the moment ask ourselves this question. If one man had the production facilities and another had the distribution facilities, how long would it take two such men to get together to do some business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the gentleman suppose that the legitimate distillers are not going to operate through legitimate retail outlets, or does the gentleman suppose that we are going to sit supinely by and make no effort whatever to eradicate the bootlegger and the gangster from this country?

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I have listened patiently to the gentleman's speech and I should like to ask the gentleman what tax he thinks would be reasonable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think \$1.50 per gallon would be ample.

Mr. DIES. If we levy a tax of \$1.50 per gallon, what assurance do we have that the municipalities and the States will not treble or quadruple that and thus defeat our purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You have no assurance except that if Uncle Sam sets the pace for municipalities and the States, why should not they walk in with \$1,000 license fees and \$2 gallonage taxes? We have already set the pace for them by hanging all the burdens of government upon whisky and beer, and they are simply following in our wake.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman heard the statement made on the floor here that the \$2 tax does not compare with the tax imposed in Europe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I have heard there is a tax of \$7 a gallon upon whisky in Canada, and it used to be \$8, and I am wondering whether, as a matter of fact, the very fact there is a \$7 tax is not the thing that has driven down consumption there and caused the Canadians to drink more wine, that does not pay nearly the same rate of tax.

Let me add this: In 1912 they had a population of seven and a third millions in Canada and they consumed about seven and two thirds million proof gallons of whisky.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FREAR. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, the per capita consumption in 1912 was 1.3 gallons. In 1914 it was 1.1 gallons. In 1917 it was 0.7 of a gallon, and in 1925 it was 0.225 of a gallon.

Notice how consumption has dropped. They have gone over to consuming more wine, and I wonder if the tax was not the thing that cut down the consumption of liquor.

Mr. CELLER. That includes also the consumption of liquor by the American tourists.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; almost half of the provincial revenue is from that source.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman certainly sees a difference between a \$2 tax and a \$7 tax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. We have two things to keep in mind: First of all, to satisfy the requirements of revenue, and, secondly, to eliminate the bootlegger.

In order to satisfy the requirements of revenue you must have consumption of legal whisky. If they do not buy it, there will be no revenue to meet the requirements of the Budget.

You have also to consider it in the light of different conditions that obtain at the present time. Proponents of a \$2 tax go back into the past and talk about 1912, 1914, and 1917. The buying power was different in this country at that time. We did not have a lot of C.W.A.'s and P.W.A.'s and a lot of other agencies to try to rebuild and rehabilitate the purchasing power at \$15 per week. You are putting on this tax and loading up liquor at the present time when the buying power of the country is perhaps at its lowest for a long, long time. Do you think these people can go out and pay a rather exorbitant price for whisky? Do you think they are going to pay this price, including this gallonage tax, and put this money into the Treasury of the United States when they can slip around the corner and buy it from a bootlegger? I doubt it very much.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will admit, I am sure, that when they are paying \$60 and \$70 a case for his Peoria rum today, and the tax is only \$1.10, they are certainly paying an exorbitant price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York, and for the information of everybody in the Chamber, that you can buy whisky in my district in carload lots as low as \$13.10 a case.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That must be cut 50 times. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, they drink it just the same.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman states that the tax on the consumption of liquor in Canada from 1917 to 1925 declined. Does he attribute that to the high tax? A great many of the Provinces of Canada had prohibition, and therefore they had no record of how much illegal liquor was consumed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That doubtless enters into it, but the high tax increased wine consumption.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. There is very little demand for whisky in Canada, and a great many of our merchants have gone up there to buy the surplus. What we are trying to do is to eliminate the bootlegger.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, I want to give you some comparative figures. These are figures on the consumption of liquor in this country.

In 1900 the consumption was 97,000,000 gallons. In 1910 the consumption was 133,000,000. In 1914 the consumption was 143,000,000. In 1917 the consumption was 147,000,000. If you will look at the bootleg supply of 73,000,000 gallons in 1930, you will find that the bootleg liquor amounted to 50 percent of the total consumption in this country at its peak in preprohibition days.

So we want this tax brought down to where the bootlegger cannot exist.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Can the gentleman state what the price of bootleg liquor is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I can state what it is in the city of Washington, where quotations are common. I think you can buy bootleg liquor here for \$1.75 a quart.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If you can buy bootleg for \$1.75 a quart, will the gentleman explain why they are paying \$6 a quart for Peoria rum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the distinguished gentleman from New York was stung by some of the liquor dealers out there. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in approaching this question of the rate of tax on liquor had two principal factors to consider, just as all Members of the House have two factors to consider in reaching their own conclusions

as to what is the proper rate of tax to be imposed on intoxicating liquors. In the first place, we are, of course, all interested in eliminating the bootlegger at the earliest possible time, and, in the second place, we are vitally interested in securing as much revenue for the Federal Treasury as possible from this new source of revenue. That same sentiment of eliminating the bootlegger and getting as much revenue as possible consistent with a tax rate that will eliminate the bootlegger has come down, of course, from the executive department, and from the interdepartmental committee appointed by the President to consider informally this subject, and by the Rockefeller Foundation, and by all other organizations that have studied the question. All have approached it from the same standpoint—first, to eliminate the bootlegger, and, secondly, to get as much revenue as possible. All the advice that we have had from those who have given study to it in a systematic way goes to a rate of tax between \$2 and \$3 per gallon. Gentlemen recall the proposed plan of having the Federal Government collect all of the gallonage tax and then making an allocation of a certain percentage of that tax to the States upon some basis to be agreed upon for such allocation. The interdepartmental committee referred to, which was appointed by the President, recommended a \$2.60 tax to be collected by the Federal Government, 20 percent of that tax to be allocated to the various States entitled to such allocation under the plan to be adopted. The Rockefeller Foundation in its report recommended a maximum tax of \$3 per gallon, to be collected by the Federal Government and allocated to the States upon a basis not exceeding 25 percent, so that there would be no gallonage tax levied by the States. But all of these agencies that have studied the question, all of these men who have studied it from the standpoint of economics, from the standpoint of revenue, have placed their figures between \$2 and \$3 per gallon tax.

Some members of our committee felt that \$2.20 per gallon would be a proper rate of tax, provided we made no allocation to the States. Some members of our committee thought that a lower rate of tax should be imposed. We finally agreed that \$2 per gallon would be an equitable tax to be placed upon distilled spirits and would enable the legitimate producers and dealers in intoxicating liquors to compete successfully with the illicit traffic in that commodity.

Before the repeal of the eighteenth amendment the appeal went out to the country that we should repeal the prohibition amendment for the two purposes—first, to eliminate the racketeering and bootlegging and all criminal acts which have grown up as a result of prohibition; and, secondly, to get the greatest flow of revenue from liquors we could legitimately; and the question of revenue was stressed. The country was sold to the idea that the burden of tax would be greatly relieved if we had this liquor to tax and to supplement the revenues so badly needed in our Federal Treasury.

The question is, Can the legitimate trade in distilled liquor at a \$2-tax per gallon survive? Every witness who appeared before our committee who testified to the cost of producing a gallon of whisky put that cost at about \$1 or \$1.20 per gallon in the hands of the wholesaler. That is, that was the cost of producing liquor and getting it into the hands of the wholesaler. Some of them included in that \$1.20 a gallon cost the profits which would come throughout the transactions down to and including the retailer; but we will accept the general opinion of those men who testified as to the cost of producing a gallon of whisky at \$1.20 a gallon in the hands of the wholesaler.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BLANCHARD. In order to inquire if the cost was figured for real whisky or on blended whisky?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The cost was figured on straight whisky. That would be 30 cents a quart. A tax of \$2 a gallon would be 50 cents a quart tax. There you would have an 80-cent cost for your liquor in the hands of the whole-

salor. If that quart of liquor is sold for \$1.50, that would be a 70-cent margin of profit, including the cost of handling from the wholesaler to the retailer and to the consumer; and I believe that it cannot be gainsaid that 70 cents a quart margin above the cost of the tax and of manufacture is a reasonable profit.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman, of course, is entirely correct in what he says, but his premise does not appear to me to be quite accurate. He is forgetting the State, county, and city taxes that would be levied in every community in the United States; and, of course, they will vary. The District of Columbia is arranging for a very heavy retailer's tax, a consumption tax, which the gentleman's figures do not include.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is true; and, if we levied a 50-cent tax per gallon, the States would levy a \$2 tax per gallon.

Mr. BRITTEN. Probably.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. There is no question about that. Are we going to retire from this taxing field? Up until the time of prohibition the gallonage tax was the exclusive field of the Federal Government. Now the States are coming in and levying gallonage tax, and to the extent that we reduce the gallonage tax for the Federal Government just that much greater will be the gallonage tax placed thereon by the States.

We cannot control that; and unless we are prepared to retire from this field and leave it to the States, then we are justified in levying a tax upon intoxicating liquors that of itself and by itself will be considered a reasonable tax and will bring to the Treasury a reasonable amount of revenue.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Did the committee give any consideration to the idea of placing a Federal tax on liquor and returning a portion of that tax to the States and municipalities?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The committee gave very serious consideration to that question, and the committee was unable to agree upon any basis of allocation. It seemed somewhat ideal in its aspects. We felt if we could confine the taxing of intoxicating liquors to one tax, and that levied by the Federal Government with the condition that a certain portion of it be allocated to the States, we might go a long way toward solving the proposition of a reasonable tax.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact that all the testimony before the committee indicated clearly that the only reasonable tax which the Government could levy was this gallonage tax? In other words, the Government could not, with satisfaction, enter any other field of taxation except the gallonage-tax field?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The gentleman is entirely correct in that, and we did not invade any other field. We confined our action to levying the gallonage tax.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I understand the principle is to keep the tax so low that you will be able to fight off the well-entrenched bootlegging industry. The battle will be all the stronger between the legal industry and the illegal industry in the first few years. Did the committee consider a sort of progressive tax, a very low tax the first year, a slightly higher tax the second year, and then up to \$2 the third year? By that time you will, by virtue of the advantage you give to the legal trader with the low tax, have destroyed the illegal industry.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I may say the committee gave consideration to that question, and the committee decided it would not be a very wholesome thing, from the standpoint of law enforcement, to advertise to the bootlegger that we are simply postponing the time when he can come in with high-priced liquor and compete with the legitimate

trade. In other words, if we have a low tax this year, the bootlegger may hold off, provided he is notified in advance that next year the tax will be high.

Mr. CELLER. Would not the organized traffic get stronger in the interval? They will be supplying the demand and getting the trade and thus oust the legal trader.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. There is some force to the gentleman's argument.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Prior to the adoption of the eighteenth amendment did any of the States levy a tax upon liquor?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. None that I recall. It is possible that Indiana did have such a tax.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. There was nothing to prevent them from doing that.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Nothing at all. They simply confined themselves to levying a license tax and occupational tax.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. A privilege tax.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is correct. Now, I want to take Dr. Doran's testimony before the committee; and I have modified his figures a little, because he was basing his calculations upon a proposal to tax liquor at \$2.60. That was the proposal of the interdepartmental committee; but I am taking the figure of \$2 a gallon instead of \$2.60, and using his highest cost figures. Dr. Doran, whom you all know, and in whose judgment you have confidence on this particular subject, stated that a tax of \$2 would be \$6 a case. There are 3 gallons to the case, as I understand it. He said it would cost five or six dollars to produce a case of whisky. I took \$6 and used that figure as the highest figure. That would be \$6 a case for producing the whisky. We then have the cost of producing the whisky and the tax totaling \$12 a case. This case is sold for \$18, and there is \$6 margin, or \$2 a gallon profit, or 50 cents a quart profit.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Before prohibition, of course, a distiller did not make any \$2-a-gallon profit. If he made 5 or 10 cents, he thought he was very fortunate, and the gentleman never heard of a distiller who was not a millionaire.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, the gentleman knows what I am trying to do is to have more of that \$2 profit for the Government.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Washington 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. There was evidence before our committee that in preprohibition times many of the distillers were operating on a margin of 5 or 10 cents a gallon, and most of them were making money.

Now, that brings me to this question: There is no absolute relationship between the amount of tax and the price which the consumers pay for liquor which they consume. I made inquiries in Silver Spring, Md., where they have a liquor store. They have a State tax of \$1.10, and we have a Federal tax of \$1.10 at this time, and that liquor was selling for as high as \$7.30 a quart, with only \$2.20 total tax per gallon. You are not going to eliminate the bootlegger simply through taxation, simply through the rate of tax that you levy. It is true, if you put the rate of tax too high, it will not eliminate the bootlegger. However, I do not agree with my friend from New York that \$5 is a reasonable tax. I think it is too high; but his argument is sound as to the relationship between the tax and the cost of liquor.

In other words, the cost of liquor is not determined in a major way by the tax imposed.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was one of the aims of the committee to keep the tax down to a point where it would be possible to sell whisky at retail at \$1.50 a quart or less.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is right. It was the testimony of the representative of a distillery in Kentucky who appeared before the committee that whisky could be produced in an up-to-date, modern distillery, using modern methods, at 26 cents a gallon with a good profit. Other witnesses testified that the manufacture of whisky could be had at a cost of 30 cents or 40 cents a gallon. The outside figure was \$1.20. So, I say, Mr. Chairman, that with a \$2-per-gallon tax these distillers, these producers, can put out a good quality of liquor at a reasonable price, at a price not exceeding \$1.25 or \$1.50 a quart. All this talk about getting the tax down to \$1.75 or \$1.50 a gallon is simply an appeal by these producers to widen by that much their already great margin of profit.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman believe, in line with what he has just said, that if there were no tax at all on liquor today—and it is only \$1.10—the price would be just as high as it is today?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is true. There must be some other control methods.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SISSON. Did not the committee take testimony as to the price now at which the distiller is legally furnishing whisky—that is, either straight whisky or blended whisky?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The cost to the distiller? Yes. We have testimony to the effect, generally speaking, that it ranged around \$1 to \$1.20 a gallon, but none of it went higher than \$1.20.

Mr. SISSON. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the druggist, the legitimate druggist, purchasing legitimately, is obliged to pay for straight whisky from \$30 to \$36 a case—in other words, \$3 a quart—and for blended whisky \$2 to \$3 a quart?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I have understood that is true.

Mr. SISSON. One further question: Is it not the opinion of the gentleman and the gentleman's committee that the distiller at the present time is getting an exorbitant profit, four or five times as much as he is entitled to?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Somebody is getting it. I do not know who it is.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall, I am sure, that the witness from Kentucky, who testified and gave some rather valuable information to the committee, stated, and it is in the record, that he would be willing to enter into a contract to deliver the old standard brands and qualities of whisky for \$5 a case. The gentleman recalls that statement, does he not?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I recall it. It is absolutely correct. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to yield me a little more time.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it not be proper in making any observation upon the cost of so-called "good whisky" here in the East, to say that, for the fiscal year there was available only 1,000,000 gallons of 4-year-old whisky, if I remember Dr. Doran's figures correctly; and that this whisky standing in the warehouse had shrunk—that there was less—that it had to be regaged; and that by the time one figured the investment in the warehouse and everything, that perhaps it was not so greatly out of line at this particular time, with a limited supply.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Do not take all my time, please.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all I wished to say. I merely wanted to get this observation in the RECORD.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. We are faced with a very vital question. We heard read this morning the President's message, in which it was stated that within the next 6 months we shall be faced with the necessity of borrowing new money to the amount of \$6,000,000,000 and the refunding of \$4,000,000,000 of outstanding obligations. When we borrow this \$6,000,000,000, we must be prepared to meet the service charge upon it. It will be recalled that in the last session of Congress when we borrowed \$3,300,000,000 under the authority of the N.R.A. we had to provide from taxes a fund of \$227,000,000 to meet the interest and sinking fund upon that borrowing. We are now confronted with this staggering amount of \$6,000,000,000, which the President says we must borrow; and we must also service this amount of new borrowings which the Government will be forced to make. It will require at least \$400,000,000 to service it, and we have not got the taxes at the present time to provide the money.

We have read the newspapers. We have kept up with the condition of the Federal Treasury. We are at this time running over a billion dollars behind the current receipts, yet we have got to meet these additional expenses necessary to service this \$6,000,000,000 of new borrowings.

Now, are we going to make liquor stand its share or are we going to place the entire burden upon other commodities? Are we going to search for other sources of revenue? We have here an opportunity to get a considerable portion of it from intoxicating liquors. I think your constituency, and my constituency, and the country at large, will respond more gladly to the idea of placing this burden upon liquor than placing it on gasoline or some other commodities used in everyday life, thereby increasing the already great burden upon the people through the collection of these additional taxes.

I think I know the sentiment of this House toward a sales tax. If we have to levy more taxes to meet the additional expenditures of this Government, it seems to me we may have to resort to some such scheme as that. We must have this money, and we must get it from some source. Are we going to make liquor bear its proportion of this burden to the fullest extent possible in keeping with the primary idea of stamping out the bootleg industry? We can do this by levying a tax of \$2 a gallon on whisky.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I think most of us will agree with that fundamental principle; but the question is whether \$2 would not be too high, and in that connection let me call the gentleman's attention to page 314 of the hearings in connection with what the gentleman said, namely, that the amount of tax has no appreciable relation to selling price. I find these facts:

The United Kingdom has increased the tax on distilled spirits at different times from \$2.62 in 1914 to \$12.88 in 1922 per United States proof gallon. As shown in table 2, the consumption was reduced as the rate of tax increased.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Everybody recognizes that principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, when the eighteenth amendment was repealed, the President issued a proclamation which eliminated from our tax structure four items of excise taxes, carrying an estimated revenue of \$227,000,000. That \$227,000,000 must be made up out of the revenue from liquor.

In addition to that \$227,000,000, we have to make up an additional \$400,000,000, or thereabouts, of new revenue in order to take care of the servicing of this prospective borrowing of \$6,000,000,000 within the next 6 months. I appeal to you to place upon liquor this tax of \$2. Do not

be carried away with the idea that you must place the tax at \$1.50 or \$1.75 in order to let legitimate traffic survive.

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman is pressed for time, I shall be glad to yield him some of my time.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I should be glad to have 5 or 10 minutes more.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman 10 minutes of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes; but do not make a speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman does not forget that when they imposed added postage revenue and nuisance taxes the aggregate revenue returned was altogether disappointing, as indicated by the fiscal record?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This same thing might apply here?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Oh, yes; it would apply if you made the tax too high. I agree with that. I am saying, however, that \$2 is a very moderate tax. This traffic will stand \$3 per gallon and permit the sale of whisky at \$1.50 a quart if you do not insist on too wide a margin of profit for the industry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the gentleman's view, and the view of the committee, that the adoption of the twenty-first amendment repealed the provisions of the Volstead Act, as well as the provisions of the beer bill, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors generally?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes; it repealed all that part which had to do with prohibition.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There were certain provisions in connection with the Volstead Act that were of a permanent character and which did not rely on the eighteenth amendment. I refer to the prohibition concerning sale, manufacture, and transportation.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And it is the gentleman's view, and, as I understand it, the view of the Attorney General, that the adoption of the twenty-first amendment repealed the prohibition provisions?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. In the main, it repealed the Volstead Act.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] thinks the tax upon liquor should be low enough to stimulate its consumption. I do not think that was the purpose of repeal. Is there any valid reason why we should consider, in discussing the tax on liquor, the failure of the Government to exercise its police powers?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. None at all. The gentleman is correct in that; but, of course, the rate of tax has some influence on the volume of consumption. Our experts have made various calculations and have submitted estimates, and at the \$2 rate they estimate there will be a consumption of 150,000,000 gallons of domestic liquors—

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. In just a moment I shall be pleased to yield.

Probably 20 or 25 million gallons of imported liquors for the first year.

We expect from this a revenue of \$375,000,000. We expect from wine something like \$10,000,000 of revenue, which will bring us approximately \$400,000,000 of revenue from distilled liquors and wines.

We are not taking into consideration in this calculation the beer tax, because we have that already, and that is now going into the Treasury. It runs around \$135,000,000 to \$150,000,000 a year.

So we will have from the taxes on liquors of all kinds approximately \$600,000,000 a year of revenue, but we need much more revenue than that to balance our Budget, and we cannot afford to reduce this tax to the point where we

are sacrificing revenue. We must put the tax at the point where it will bring in the maximum amount of revenue consistent with stamping out the bootlegger, and we think we have gone just as far as we can go, although a higher rate might bring in a little more money than the \$2 rate.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman made the statement a moment ago that you could tax liquor \$3 a gallon and still sell it for \$1.50 a quart. I am wondering if the gentleman takes into consideration the State tax that has been placed on liquor by the State legislatures, and whether the gentleman knows anything about the political hierarchy that has been built up in the State of Pennsylvania through the State liquor stores by the Pinchot organization.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I am talking about Federal taxes. Of course, you could leave the whole question of taxation to the States, and they might put on a \$3 tax, but if you reduced the Federal tax to 50 cents a gallon, then the States would probably come in with a \$2 or a \$2.50 tax. The State of Pennsylvania, as I understand it, at the present time has a floor tax of \$2 a gallon, and has practically paralyzed the business there for the present.

Mr. BOLAND. And, of course, they have established a political hierarchy that the gentleman knows about.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. But the point is that somebody is going to levy a tax on liquor, and is the Federal Government going to get in on it or are you going to leave it entirely to the States?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question along the line of the anticipated revenue?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As the gentleman will recall, in anticipating the revenue from beer, the consumption, as I recall, in 1918 was 68,000,000 barrels. The Treasury officials figured that the consumption would never be the same, but would be greatly reduced, and I agree that that opinion was correct. So they took a figure of 30,000,000 barrels and estimated that at \$5 a barrel it would raise \$150,000,000. I understand this estimate will not be far out of the way, and instead of a consumption of 68,000,000 barrels of beer, we will only have a consumption of 30,000,000 barrels of beer.

Now as to spiritous liquors, I believe that the consumption will not be, at most, over one half of what it used to be. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not in considering the anticipated revenue at \$2 he has taken one half of the old consumption, or what figure has been taken?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. No; we have not taken that. Of course, in 1912, 1913, and along in there, we were consuming about 140,000,000 gallons a year, and in 1916 and 1917 it went up to about 164,000,000 gallons a year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. At \$2 a gallon I understand the gentleman expects to raise \$350,000,000 from spiritous liquors.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That will include customs duties also.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How many gallons does the gentleman estimate?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. We estimate 150,000,000 gallons at \$2, which will be \$300,000,000, and then we estimate we will probably get \$75,000,000 more from customs, making a total of \$375,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am afraid the gentleman is going to be disappointed, and I am for a high tax to get the revenue.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I agree that other estimates are lower, but they are all estimates, of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In my opinion, you will never get \$375,000,000 from spiritous liquors unless you have a tax of at least \$5.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. But you would cut down the consumption.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do not worry about that for the first year. The people will have to have it the first year.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I agree with the principle underlying the statement of the gentleman from Illinois as to the relationship between price and tax, but I think he is going too strong on the matter of tax. I think \$2 a gallon

is a reasonable tax, a very moderate tax, and I believe the liquor traffic can stand it and stamp out the big bootlegger, and I appeal to the membership of the House to put that tax in this bill. I assure you we have given this matter very serious consideration. I am not asking you to take our judgment alone. Your judgment is as good as ours, but we have had the privilege of having before us those who have studied this matter from the standpoint of the economics involved and from the standpoint of sociology and from all its various angles, and when we considered it on the basis of all the information we have, we feel that a tax of \$2 a gallon is a reasonable tax and will probably bring in the highest amount of revenue to the Government and will help us, to that extent, in balancing our Budget.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Did the committee consider the matter of having freer importation of whisky in order that we might get better whisky drunk in this country? We have only 1,000,000 gallons of old whisky, I understand. Everything else is young and therefore very immature and bad for the health of the Nation. Should there not be some method by which we could get better whisky and get it from sources that now have it, namely, Canada, England, and others?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. We considered the matter from that angle. It is a matter of general knowledge that the importers are moving heaven and earth to get import quotas. They are going to bring in all the outside whisky that will be permitted, and we think that for the first year we will get all the imports possible at the rate of \$5 a gallon, plus the internal tax of \$1.10 or \$2, whichever may be the final action of the Congress, and thereby replenish our Treasury to that extent.

After that time the tariff tax may have to be reduced.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. After all is not that quantity fixed by the Federal Alcohol Control Administration?

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman think that there ought to be more liberality in that regard? We know that we have not enough old and mature whisky and we need it, and if you limit the quantity to be imported the American public will have to suffer.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. If the gentleman is correct in his statement, that is not to be done here under this bill, but it is under the control of the Federal Alcohol Control Administration?

Mr. CELLER. But the Federal Alcohol Control Administration have narrowed the quantity to a point where it is negligible.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. There are 25,000,000 gallons of whisky in Canada, and no doubt a great part of that whisky will come into the United States for the purpose of being split twice, or perhaps 24 times, as the gentleman from New York says.

Mr. CELLER. I understand that they are having great difficulty in bringing it into the United States.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I think that difficulty will be ironed out, and it will come in.

Mr. CELLER. I do not wish to blame the Federal Alcohol Control Administration. I think it is doing a good piece of work, but Congress ought to have something to say about it. Congress ought to say to them that they should be more liberal. Congress might well direct the Roosevelt administration to increase the whisky imports. Under the narrow limits laid down by the Administration, Mr. Choate and his colleagues are doing a fine piece of work. They should be given greater latitude, greater liberality as to quotas concerning whisky from Canada and England.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Is it not a fact that the committee gave full consideration to this matter, and the

committee thought that with the municipal taxes and all other taxes that would follow that the \$2 tax would be about all the traffic would bear?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. The gentleman is correct. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise more particularly for the purpose of speaking good words for the administration of the committee under Chairman DOUGHTON and of Chairman HILL, who has just spoken.

We came here on summons about the 1st of November, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] was chairman of the subcommittee, and committee experts sought to devise means of closing up some of the stopgaps in the income tax law and of curing other loopholes. That bill has not yet come before you, but the subcommittee and full committee have been at work on it. Without fear of contradiction I can say that members of both committees, Republicans as well as Democrats, or in reverse order, Democrats as well as Republicans, have had no serious controversy in the committee at any time. We recognize those in control of the committee, the majority, could put through any piece of legislation desired. But they have been very fair. I speak as an individual, and I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Washington for the consideration they have both given us.

On the question of the gallonage tax, referred to by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL], a majority of the members of the committee were in favor of that gallonage tax from the first. I was not, for my experience with the estate tax was such that it was started at 25 percent and then rose to 80 percent of every dollar collected by the Federal Government, which was credited on estate collections by the different States. Therefore, a constant controversy might exist, with percentages allocated by the Government to the States, together with difficulty in administration in both the dry States and the wet States. Notwithstanding it sounds well in theory and was furnished to us by the interdepartmental committee, we believed it impossible to administer properly, and so the committee simply legislated as to the Federal Government tax to be collected and retained.

You have heard that tax rate discussed here today. An interesting feature which gentlemen on both sides of the aisle may have noticed is that Members from the same State of New York and from the same city are at extreme ends upon the amount of Federal gallonage tax to be collected. Some would have it as high as \$5 to \$10 a gallon, on the theory the tax is a small part of the sale price, while others would have it as low as \$1.50, or thereabouts. No scientific administration can be had in any way. No argument here will decide rates. We had 25 or 30 of the supposedly best experts on the question of a proper tax to impose. On the Republican side we accepted the tax fixed by the committee without debate, not because of any spirit of hostility, but we felt that the administration was carrying the burden. The administration wanted a \$2 tax. The majority Members finally were a unit for that, and we voted "present", not with any hesitation about expressing ourselves but that was the best course to pursue; and the majority Members found that no objection or obstacle was placed in their way by the minority.

No Member on the floor of the House knows any more about it than did the witnesses before us, and even they generally disagreed. The matter of rates that would encourage bootleggers, question of importations, cost of production—all questions were threshed over constantly without reaching any result. The majority members on the Democratic side brought in this \$2 tax, and it was not opposed by the minority.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MAY. Did the committee consider the fact in determining the rate of tax to be levied that all the States and municipalities are practically bankrupt themselves, and

that they perhaps would be hunting liquor as a source of revenue and would perhaps put on an additional tax, not in order to foster bootlegging, and that in consequence of that the Federal tax ought to be less?

Mr. FREAR. I object to the last phrase of the gentleman's question, because he merely expresses his individual opinion. Many witnesses brought out that proposition with the thought that unless you have a dictatorship no one can determine what each State and county and city will establish as a tax. That was an argument made to us repeatedly.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that \$1 per gallon tax by the Federal Government would give more leeway to the States, and that they would not put on an additional tax which would encourage bootlegging?

Mr. FREAR. No; assuredly not, and I refer that question to the expert from New York, Mr. O'CONNOR, who has questioned speakers. He thinks the tax ought to be as high as \$10 perhaps; and his judgment is fully as good as any, I presume, if not as good possibly as that of my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky. I have been known as a "dry Member." We are taking the situation as it comes to us today. Friends on the dry side of the aisle as well as those on the other have said, What are we going to do with the bill and rates? The people on a plebiscite decided that the eighteenth amendment should be repealed. They gave a tremendous majority for repeal. Are we to refuse to act and permit the country after a repeal of the amendment to go without enforcement laws or must we legislate about it? It is the only thing that can be done. Otherwise we would have no law on the subject. Then bootleggers would thrive without restriction. That is a situation that confronts the House and those who are pulling the laboring oar here. Administration members of the committee have recommended a \$2 tax, and have also recommended a tax upon wines. Those rates will remain in my judgment as the opinion of the House.

I want to say one word on the subject of the repeal plebiscite. I believe, as stated, it was a tremendous expression of the American people's desire which was had. All must accept the decision of far more than the constitutional two-thirds majority. That is popular government. The result of the vote on repeal was probably a surprise to all Members. It disclosed the disposition of the American people on nonenforcement of law. They want no more of speak-easies or the bootleggers, although these will never be wholly eliminated. What they want is to have a legitimate tax levied and collected and laws enforced. Every prosecuting officer—and I am satisfied many of you Members present have been prosecuting officers in the past—all know that in the trials of liquor in the courts you have always been aided by the man paying a license, who was always anxious to convict the man in competition with him who was without a license. By the enactment of this law, which will be passed by the House tomorrow, you will have put a number of active agencies into alliance with those who seek, so far as they can, to secure law enforcement and outlaw the bootlegger and speak-easy, because they are in direct competition with the legitimate liquor dealer. You will find that they are very helpful.

Mr. Chairman, in further respect to the plebiscite I should like to insert portions of a speech I made in Milwaukee during the summer, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include that and other data.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, let me say further it is significant that the first bill on the calendar for discussion and passage this session is the so-called "liquor bill" reported by our committee, which follows repeal of the eighteenth amendment by the people in 1933. President Roosevelt urged repeal and a resulting tax income by passage of the bill. I am not discussing merits of repeal or of the purpose of this bill or of rates of tax herein provided. Part of that discussion is water over the wheel. The people of this country by an overwhelming vote have, as stated, given Congress a mandate.

President Roosevelt has frankly stated the case and demanded of Congress and the people an end of the bootlegging crime wave. The result reached in the country indicates a controlling influence through the President. He has had the final voice here as to tax and license rates. With repeal now voted by the people, control can only be exercised by law and that control with rates fixed by the administration is placed in the hands of those responsible for enforcement.

I call attention to power the President exercises in this and many other relief proposals with a hope that President Roosevelt may assume power to urge upon Congress a matter of far greater import than any policy or plan yet placed before him. With that purpose I have caused to be inserted herein my speech before the National Fraternal Congress, recently given in Milwaukee, with arguments there presented, together with quotations from past speeches in the House on the same general subject, with other data.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES A. FREAR BEFORE THE NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS OF AMERICA, MILWAUKEE, WIS., AUGUST 20, 1933

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman who is to talk to us is first an American and a patriot. He has supported recent administrations in efforts to lift the depression fog. He has served in both branches of the Wisconsin Legislature, also as a high State officer for several terms, and also as a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means and other important committees in the National Congress. He has fought against "pork barrel" legislation, has opposed prohibitory tariffs and oppressive consumption taxes, and, apart from aiding Indian relief and other constructive work, has waged a constant war against war propaganda with its rapidly increasing tremendous appropriations for more wars and armaments. In point of services, he is the best-known Congressman from Wisconsin. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you one of our distinguished citizens who is to talk on the subject "Arms Embargo", Congressman FREAR.

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR. Ladies and gentlemen of this congress, permit me to disclaim credit over others for any legislative course that may have been taken. Opportunity, experience, and work are the best essentials in legislation. I am here to urge, however, that needless recent war might and should have been prevented, and to give evidence that more wars now threaten. In response to suggestions offered, I never discuss politics or partisanship on such occasions; in fact, we have a surfeit of it in Congress, where my own record is known. Members of Congress from my State generally have warmly supported the President in his relief program. He has a great problem to solve, but not comparable to the fundamental causes for our national distress, often preventable, and which may come before him later for decision.

Colonel Drew of Canada spoke to you last year on "reasons for war." I assume that may explain why my friend Herman Ekern of Wisconsin, well known to this congress, asked me to discuss before you that same subject from the standpoint of a legislator. A deep interest in war prevention, the greatest problem now confronting every country, including our own, impelled me to postpone other appointments and accept this invitation to address your honorable body.

Losses and suffering 15 years after the last war still encompass the entire world. Burdened by a heavy economic depression, due to that war, our people are among its heavy sufferers. Wars again threaten to engulf the world. I have urged a constitutional amendment for a plebiscite on war, before Congress again declares war and a further provision that no American citizen shall be conscripted to fight in Europe or Asia. If adopted, it will help to keep us out of war. Under our form of Government every citizen has some measure of responsibility for conditions, and that should be exercised as to war. My resolution gives that right.

"ALL EUROPE IS ON THE BRINK OF WAR"

From high authorities let me quote war predictions made within the past few weeks. Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a conservative man, a former committee colleague and personal friend declared at the close of the recent World Economic Conference in London, that "Increasing war armaments are more dangerous than ever before in their wildest rivalry." Russia's chairman, there present, responded to Secretary Hull with the startling statement: "A small shock will let loose the disaster of war, the most terrible in all history."

Traveling 8,000 miles throughout Russia since the war, I know something of war conditions in the great Muscovite country that threw 12,000,000 Russians into the last war, suffered over 9,000,000 casualties and resulted in a revolution that overthrew the Czar and his Government.

Morgenthau, Sr., one of President Roosevelt's close advisers, recently said: "All Europe is ready and on the brink of war." Lloyd's shipping firm recently predicted European war chances at 3 to 1, to come inside of 18 months. Ex-Secretary of War Baker and Frank Simonds, expert war correspondent, both declared war will soon come and our participation is "inevitable."

Every war expert voices prophecies of early war in Europe. Fear, hatred, and revenge continue to actuate European nations

today and the world soon will be thrown into another madhouse. Will we keep out?

No people in the entire world have voice against war lords. That right is surrendered in every country to war profiteers. Testimony discloses wars are declared through "world leaders" who respond to war propaganda by press, pictures, and profiteers' appealing to hate and greed, all instigated by munition makers and those who profit by wars. That, I would discuss.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ACT FOR ITS OWN PROTECTION

Self-preservation for our own country is a first law, not selfish but logical. As a burnt child dreads the fire, we may well question our own course when governments quibble over economic and political issues while secretly deliberating and planning for war. Accepting war predictions at one half their assumed value, their importance is certain, more serious in fact than any other problem. After a century and a half the greatest world democracy has not advanced one step toward a national peace policy. Until some better plan is offered, a plebiscite on war in advance of congressional action is infinitely better than big battleships and bigger armies that waste enormously both money and men by inviting war.

Let us briefly review differences that provoke wars and what can be done in advance to prevent needless war. Not by international conferences, which have regularly failed, but by preventive legislation before too late to act.

The world views our efforts for "peace" with suspicion. Needless to say, we have failed to invite world confidence and are distrusted as an international meddler, carrying a frayed Monroe Doctrine banner with our peace proposals while resenting that same principle if claimed by others.

We initiate peace conferences, propose reduction of armaments and "humane" methods of warfare, while vigorously preparing for war and financing other countries similarly engaged.

In these days of modern warfare, when poison fumes destroy regiments of men; of huge armored tanks that crush down buildings in their path; of murderous bombs from airplanes that wipe out villages peopled by peaceful old men, women, and children; when the stench and noise of packing houses built for killing are rivaled by that of battlefields and trenches; when war's glamor is amid mud and grime today with cries of wounded soldiers and noncombatants alike, due to hysterical hymns of hate; at this time calling for sane reasoning, let us talk frankly of wars induced by modern propaganda, of wars that threaten to destroy civilization, to offer in advance a war barrier, to be removed if at all by those who fight and pay. My resolution now before Congress requiring the people to vote on war before Congress again declares war is a right that should be exercised by constitutional amendment.

THE PRICE OF WAR

War experts announce we will soon be engaged in another war. If one's husband, son, or brother is killed or dies in France as occurred with 88 boys from my home company, what is the price? What value has the supreme sacrifice to youth, or even aged war profiteers, fixed at their own estimate? Life is dear at any price, yet Caesar, drunk or sober, never ruled more autocratically than do our modern war lords, when ready for war. Reference made to recent wars is not to resurrect dead issues, but serves as a warning against vicious war propaganda pending our Government's recent declarations of war that ever surround Presidents and Congress when war hysteria prevents sane reasoning.

ALLIES, ARMAMENTS, AND WAR DEBTS

If the United States can carry through a national relief and economic policy or can effect a gold revaluation, independent of Europe, it can and should adopt a separate war policy where the people shall first decide on war. Lives are more important than dollars. All other peace plans have failed. Let the people rule as to peace and war. If resulting in a preventive of war with us, which it will be, other people and other nations will insist on that same pre-war policy.

Self-preservation with our Nation is not selfish when it rejects alliances with those who repudiate peace, disarmament, and war-debt obligations. Saved by us from Germany's present plight, Europe is in a mad race for armaments, urged also on this Nation by those who profit by wars at home or abroad. War debts and armament expenditures by our former allies are beyond belief.

Scheduled annual European payments on war debts due the United States in 1933 reached only 4.1 percent of Great Britain's budget, only 2 percent of the French budget, and only 1.4 percent of Italy's budget. These three debtors owe this Government over 90 percent of the total \$11,000,000,000 defaulted war debts. Why did they default?

Another picture. Great Britain is spending 13 percent of her annual budget for armament; France, 27 percent of her budget for armament, or 13 times her pledged debt; and Italy, 33 percent, or one third of its budget for armament, or 25 times its debt pledged to us. These figures by Samuel Crowther in "America Self-contained", if accurate, give an example of national ingratitude and repudiation by our allies, caused in part by insane "preparedness" against each other, all fruit of the last war and early seed sown for another war. Debt reductions, cancellation, and another alliance in Europe will again be urged by war lords. Our only insurance against this monstrous folly is by a plebiscite before another war declaration by Congress, not by our own enormous armament expenditures that, like France and Italy, reach an unbelievable part of our normal budget.

Get this straight. Fifteen years ago we loaned the allies \$11,000,000,000 of American taxpayers' money, or about \$100 raised here per capita. This was in addition to \$25,000,000,000 or more we spent for that same war. Of \$300,000,000 now due on European settlement terms, less than 3 cents on a dollar has been paid this year. Probably \$30,000,000,000 have been spent by the Allies since the war for armaments with which to kill each other. Repudiation and increased hate is that war's harvest. It all reminds us of a childhood jingle, slightly paraphrased:

We have a patient work horse, his name is U.S.A.;
We loaned him to our allies, to drive the Bosch away.
They skinned him, they slashed him, they drove him through the mire;
Again the patient horse they need to steer them through hell-fire.

Suffering from blind staggers due to rough European treatment, supplemented by a modern diet of I O U scraps of paper, the above nag awaits his next conscription. Will it come again? (Baker and Simonds say "inevitably." Munitions makers, who swing the whip that drives, say "undoubtedly.")

Misdirected mortals who pay the fiddler and do the fighting ask, "Where do we come in?" Their voice can only be heard through a pre-war plebiscite. Congress is asked to give that right by a Constitutional amendment which provides—

"Congress shall have power to declare war only after the proposition shall have been submitted by the President to the several States and a majority of the States at general or special elections called by the governors thereof shall have approved the same." * * * (Quoted in full hereafter.)

WILLFULLY FALSE PROPAGANDA

The debatable cause for destruction of the *Maine* was made an excuse for war, urged by a relentless, reckless American news propaganda that swept us into war with Spain and held us permanently responsible for Cuban peace and prosperity. In making the world free for democracy at that same time we seized the Philippines, carrying along our Monroe Doctrine banner, although Theodore Roosevelt declared, a self-evident fact at that time, that the islands in Asia could not be held in time of war and were a dangerous liability in peace or war. For a third of a century we have weighed commercial value of these islands against their rights to independence, protesting our love for the little brown brother, who resents a 7,000-mile distant guardianship. That was the Genesis and a result of our "war for humanity" against Spain.

Lord Northcliff, with others, during the European war released a flood of English and American propaganda that swept us into another war for humanity and a "last war to end wars." Munition makers and war-supply agencies during the World War had reached their end of European credit, until only by our entrance into that war could we be made guarantors to those American munition makers and war agencies so as to secure more war supplies for new-found allies. That result was brought about.

Along with 60,000,000 other soldiers, ours were then thrown into the war vortex, ending with a Versailles Treaty containing countless injustices, a treaty we refused to sign because it made certain more wars and left us in the anomalous position of guaranteeing an impossible European peace while ruthlessly denying rights of self-determination to peoples whose cause was voiced as our justification for war.

Yet, professing fear from foreign invasion of our rights by countries of Europe with whom we were at peace, and again voicing humanitarian ideals, we were finally swept into that World War, although Norway, Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, Spain, and other countries were undisturbed by century-old enemies battling at their doors. Presumably they did not have heavy foreign investments in jeopardy. Whatever the controlling agency, we blundered into war then and will blunder again when financially inspired propaganda and war lords unite to arouse war hysteria. Carnegie's many millions profits from armor-plate contracts are recalled incidentally among those who profit by wars, and there are others whom I would discuss.

Now we come to evidence heretofore placed before you that cannot be ignored.

Col. George A. Drew, a brave, wounded war veteran and commander of the Eleventh Field Brigade, Canadian Artillery, during the war, last year addressed your fraternal congress. I am reading brief extracts from Colonel Drew's statement then made to you. He said:

"The world today is spending something over \$7,000,000,000 on armaments, in preparation for war, every year. * * * President Wilson, General Smuts, Lloyd George, and others who were closely associated with the drafting of the Covenant of the League had become tremendously impressed during the closing days of the Great War in the very close connection between armament manufacturers and the governments of the countries in which those factories lay. This committee went into the question, and in 1921 brought in their report. Their conclusions were:

ARMAMENT FIRMS BRIBE OFFICIALS AND FOMENT WAR

"1. That armament firms have been active in fomenting war scares and in persuading their own countries to adopt warlike policies and to increase their armaments.

"2. That armament firms have attempted to bribe government officials both at home and abroad.

"3. That armament firms have disseminated false reports concerning the military and naval programs of various countries in order to stimulate armament expenditures.

"4. That armament firms have sought to influence public opinion through the control of newspapers in their own and foreign countries."

Shall I reread the conclusions of that committee? That is how war comes.

Colonel Drew added: "Remember that document was prepared by statesmen and not radicals. * * * You may rest assured that is not an overstatement of the facts."

A terrific indictment of inhuman war profiteers stands practically undisputed today. They kill men for profit and sell their services and supplies to all purchasers as freely as did the Hessians of old, who yet were never charged with treasonably killing their own people for that profit.

Colonel Drew, a brave Canadian soldier, continued: "At Geneva William B. Shearer admitted he had already received \$55,000 as partial payment for his services for having gone to Geneva and, as he himself explained, 'sown distrust between the representatives' and, as a result, the conference broke down, or at least that was Shearer's claim. * * * President Hoover appointed a Senate committee to inquire into the facts disclosed in Shearer's action."

Further quoting from Drew: "Before that Senate committee Shearer swore that he had been employed by the armament firms to do what he could to make the British delegates distrust the American delegates at Geneva and to make the American delegates distrust the British delegates; he swore that he had been employed to do similar work on other occasions; and he swore also that other men were employed to do the same work."

A memorandum disclosing naval contracts secured by Shearer's employers is attached to my remarks and evidences the high value of such spy services to those who profit.

Shearer's employment also as a \$2,000 a month war propagandist by an American news syndicate to cover that same conference was disclosed and his suit for \$250,000 against the above-mentioned American shipbuilders is also remembered. That is background for war hysteria which comes from mob psychology fostered by war-profiteering interests.

Again Colonel Drew said at the close of his strong address to you, from which I have briefly quoted:

"We are living in a world of make-believe. We are talking peace and we are preparing for war, and the only reason that we are not getting farther in this discussion is that you have the armament companies with their desire for profits."

Colonel Drew's astounding picture is supported by many facts and witnesses. I have a long list of world armament makers and their activities, covering many pages, that is startling to people not familiar with tremendous secret influences for war held by those who have the destinies of the world in their hands through powerful control of agencies for propaganda and war.

What are we doing to combat their efforts?

They forced us into the last conflict with what result?

Neither victors nor vanquished respect us for our part in the World War, although we sacrificed our claim to constitutional rights of liberty of the citizen by conscripting for the first time in American history 4,000,000 American youths to fight Europe's battles, thereby meeting a long-expressed demand for conscription by the Army Staff, an imperialistic system fashioned after Germany, for use when appeals to "patriotism" fail in their purpose.

CONSCRIPTION OF MEN PUTS PATRIOTISM ASIDE

A much maligned word "patriotism" rests in love of home and country found in the hearts of men generally from the land of Bolivar and of Rizal, to our own, not evidenced by shouting "wolf" from housetops but by personal sacrifice when duty calls. By acts, not professions. No monopoly is had by generals or exalted dollar-a-year men, for patriotism is found equally with the private soldier and peaceful citizen. Conscription is the machine that now substitutes autocratic power for patriotism.

Patriots in peace or war are not self-glorifiers. The most vicious superpatriot organization of the World War was the so-called "National Security League", heavily financed, whose officers were disclosed by an extended Congressional investigation to be hypocritical highbinders, led by a fake "colonel", and all recommended by the committee report for criminal prosecution. Incidentally I drew and secured unanimous passage of that resolution in the House. The RECORD so shows.

The world viewed our sacrifices in the last war of nearly forty billions of dollars and countless lives and sufferings, in and out of the Army, which followed as just retribution, and rewarded our war efforts in behalf of "self-determination" of people by repudiation of many billions of their war debts, a natural result of entanglement with Europe's affairs.

In Milwaukee, the scene of this convention, war hysteria responding to propaganda ran rampant. Leading citizens declared this city in which we are now gathered then swarmed with traitors, that guns were collected in basements, that powdered glass was introduced into food, and that drinking water was poisoned. Martial law for Milwaukee was demanded from President Wilson. The war mob representatives came to Washington, but the Attorney General of the United States found all hysterical charges to be untrue and refused to interfere. His letters read to the House at the time so stated, but that was the effect of war propaganda on credulous though intelligent people.

In addition to the butchery of men, women, and children of different warring nations through war bombs, poison gas, and other modern methods of extermination of helpless human

beings, over half of Europe has reverted a century and a half from making the world "safe for democracy."

Sane, courageous men under influence of war hysteria often confuse peace measures with "pacifism." It's the women of the Nation, not easily misled, who suffer most from war, and peace lovers generally can bring about a pre-war plebiscite to prevent needless war. The war-worn nations of Europe will quickly follow with the only real peace measure afforded.

Again I offer indisputable evidence of democracy's loss through war.

THE WORLD WAR HAS PLACED DICTATORS OVER POPULAR GOVERNMENT

Following our Revolutionary War and adoption of the American Constitution, practically every government in the world gave enlarged rights to its people through parliamentary bodies and representative government. Then came marked progress in civilization. These invaluable rights have been thrown to the winds by the World War. Russia, Italy, Austria, Germany, Poland, Turkey, Spain, and others have relapsed into dictatorships with widespread break-down everywhere in constitutional popular government. That is one of the fruits of war, more disastrous in its consequences than losses of lives and property.

Without profiting by any territorial gains through a foot of soil or dollar exacted, our own losses are not yet fully measured, but we, too, are pausing on the threshold of a threatened loss in popular government more dangerous than we realize.

Carloads of medals were distributed liberally after the "war to end wars", for "valor" to recipients often not within several thousand miles of the fighting front. It was one of the humors of war and diverted attention from more material things but could not explain indefensible inefficiency in failing to supply fighting soldiers with needed protection. Appropriating over a billion dollars for airplanes and expending over a half billion dollars for planes during 19 months of war is only one illustration of many tragic pages, but speaks volumes.

NOT ONE FIGHTING PLANE AFTER A HALF BILLION DOLLARS EXPENDITURE

After more than a year and a half of war "experimentation" and expenditure of \$500,000,000 for airplanes, Secretary of War Baker gave as the result in war planes (taken from the hearings on war frauds, vol. 1, serial 2, Aviation, p. 46):

"Mr. FREAR. We did not during the whole period of the war get a single fighting machine or bombing plane to the front?"

"Secretary of War BAKER. Not a single fighting machine or bomber of American make."

This undisputed fact was confirmed by testimony of General Patrick and others. Congress appropriated over a billion dollars for planes during that war with the tragic results stated. Again quoting—

"Secretary of War BAKER. Every element for safety for anyone in such perilous occupations should be added.

"Mr. FREAR. I think so. According to your report, page 53, you say: 'The reported battle fatalities (aircraft) overseas, 244. Experience at the front indicates that two aviators lose their lives in accidents for each aviator killed in battle. Fatalities at training fields in the United States to October 24 were 262.'"

"Mr. FREAR. That makes over 500 fatalities—one half in this country—through 'accident' (same hearings, p. 53)."

Yet medals and decorations were given men responsible for that tragic record.

I could quote many pages of like character. Fine American boys we sent to war, boys as brave and daring as the best in Europe. Rickenbacker, Meissner, Mitchell, and other world-known aviators who testified before my committee. With marvelous records, they all fought in European planes—borrowed from our allies.

At the Harding Disarmament Conference in Washington, peace offerings and arms reduction promises were enthusiastically greeted by all participants, but the only nation to make any reduction gesture was ours. At Geneva thereafter, I asked Hugh Gibson, whom I first met in Warsaw, what progress was made in a second arms reduction conference directed by six American battleship admirals, our spokesmen at Geneva for peace. It was fruitless. Real peace advocates do not send machine guns or bombs or "fighting men" to further peace proposals. It was a game in which every nation played its own hand, with reservations.

EUROPE'S FEARS, HATES, AND AMBITIONS INSPIRE WARS

A picture of Europe's war attitude not found in books was learned when in Moscow we asked Tchitcherin, chief of foreign affairs, why Russia did not reduce its army, then of 650,000 men. He answered by saying that France had a standing army of 750,000 men and was financing the Polish Army of 270,000 men and also Czechoslovakian Army of 150,000. "We cannot reduce our army with that threat along our borders", he said. The reported Russian Army of several hundred thousand on their eastern front today is a buffer for Japan's war forces. That front is on the opposite side of the world.

Italy's increase in population, due to high birth rate, is the pride of Italian war officials, who compare it with that of France. That fact was stated to me repeatedly in Italy. Hitler in Germany has urged that same birth increase in man power, to be thrown, when ready, against the same common enemy. France and Germany were responsible for the last war—and for many wars. We hitched onto the tail of the French kite 16 years ago. Where next? Will Europe reform? "All my ancestors for 300 years have fought against the French", said Bismarck. That's the answer.

Many hundreds of millions of francs spent for fortifications along the southern French border are of no value, when Balbo's 24 airships, soaring high over the Alps, disclosed fortifications; and battleships have little place in modern warfare, yet the mad race for armaments goes on greater than ever in all history, with France contributing one quarter and Italy one third of their respective budgets today for armaments to use against each other.

Century-old European fears and hatreds speak through wars. The allies of yesterday may be bitter enemies tomorrow. What better war probabilities can be offered than the foregoing facts?

Less than 60 days ago the "Navy League" of America secured a naval parity construction program with over \$200,000,000 for immediate additional naval construction, in addition to our annual \$800,000,000 expenditures for Army and Navy—greater than any other country in the world. It was met by Japan on July 21 with an army budget of 645,000 yen and a naval budget of 570,000,000 yen. Japan's contempt for the League of Nations and treatment of China is fresh in every mind. Japan also meets our Navy League's challenge for naval supremacy. Human nature is the same the world over.

While sitting at the same table some years ago with Sun Yat Sen in Shanghai, I heard him denounce the "21 demands" of Japan, while he said to us, "America is the hope of the world."

A nation like ours, shaking its mailed fist in the faces of self-respecting nations, building up a huge war machine of battleships and shoulder-strapped warriors, is un-American in character and as popular in the great family of nations as a noisy bully with a chip on his shoulder, brass knuckles on his hands, challenging anyone to stop his warlike antics while singing hymns of self-praise. Acts and words are alike measured by others.

PRACTICALLY EVERYBODY FAVORS NATIONAL DEFENSE BUT NOT WAR INSANITY

"National defense" is a slogan that means anything and everything. Everybody agrees to the principle, but we are appropriating far more money than any nation in the world for "defense" today. "National defense" is as elastic as rubber and is used to quiet restive taxpayers. How much do you suppose that taxpayer is paying today for war? Practically 70 to 80 cents of every dollar, it is estimated, of ordinary current Federal taxes goes for wars, past and future.

"Preparedness" shouting is generally led by selfish interests, as disclosed by Colonel Gray. Those who echo the cry are ordinarily without knowledge of the facts nor realize that extreme preparedness is a challenge to war. They know nothing of the seamy side of modern wars or of trench conflicts or wire entanglements, machine guns, bombs, or gas, or of wounds, hospitals, or crippled bodies; but through patriotic fervor unconsciously respond to inspired propaganda. Gray paid his war debt with that service. He speaks with authority.

Normal persons, not consumed by greed or stimulated military glory, express hope that we may never have another war—a vain hope. Seemingly believing wars are caused from supernatural causes and not ordinarily by selfish human agencies, they pray for protection against war instead of studying causes and taking active steps to prevent.

Everyone who questions this policy of wasteful governmental war extravagance by unbridled greed of individuals and communities masquerading in the garb of national defense, is pilloried as a pacifist.

Yet we are paying far more in times of peace for national defense than any other country in the world, and more than double pre-war expenditures; all in times of peace and for peace purposes, we are told. Germany once set that same example, when the goose step was more popular than it is today. France is now the leader, and France is surrounded by jealous potential foes eager for war.

I have heretofore presented on the floor of the House of Representatives war preparedness figures and you will observe how our Nation has increased in the mad race and how it compares with other governments in that respect.

IN PEACE TIMES WE TOP THE WORLD IN WAR EXPENDITURES

We have recently been expending annually over \$800,000,000 for military and naval war bills, more than double what the taxpayers of this country were paying prior to the World War, as shown by the accompanying table:

	Army	Navy	Total
1916.....	\$164,635,577	\$155,029,425	\$319,665,003
1926.....	355,072,225	312,743,410	667,815,635
1927.....	360,908,777	318,909,096	679,817,873
1928.....	390,540,803	331,335,492	721,876,295
1929.....	416,901,546	364,561,544	781,463,090
1930.....	453,524,973	374,165,639	827,690,612
1931.....	478,418,974	354,071,004	832,489,978
1933.....	462,239,701	357,436,995	819,676,696

Figures taken from the World Almanac of 1933 show an increase in 15 years of total Army and naval expenditures of more than 266 percent and 1934 will reach far over a billion dollars for war preparations or more than 25 percent of ordinary Budget expenditures.

Pressure for a greater army and bigger navy is to be urged on Congress next session which reminds us of the admonition of historian Abbott, who says—

"In all despotic governments it is necessary * * * to have a powerful military force."

That warning against despots, and wars waged by despots, is observed in war when a military despotism is all-powerful in our own Government. Since the Constitution was adopted repudiating despotism, pressure has constantly been exercised on Congress by military and naval interests through misleading and half truth comparisons to show that, although spending more than any other country for national defense, we are practically defenseless. The purpose is apparent and if at all honest, reflects gross waste of funds by our war experts.

Study in this connection the following expenditures for naval purposes alone by the five principal powers, taken from the World Almanac, 1933:

	Great Britain	United States	France	Italy	Japan
1928.....	£58,123,257	\$356,597,546	\$98,046,348	\$57,589,000	\$128,203,000
1929.....	57,300,000	364,233,362	101,600,000	60,021,000	131,222,000
1930.....	55,865,000	378,879,067			
1931.....	51,739,000	375,291,828	137,516,120	80,795,701	131,468,844
1932.....	\$273,397,800	357,906,219	118,970,598	84,569,254	105,437,569
Annual average, approximately.....	\$276,000,000	366,543,603	91,224,613	56,594,991	99,260,283
Also for 1932-33.....	£56,476,360	318,906,141	94,823,500	80,947,264	246,941,797

Draw your own conclusions from these war preparations in times of peace.

Forty million active and reserve soldiers, according to the same authority, including 4,000,000 "selected" soldiers in this country, are in readiness for the next world war and add enormously to war-preparedness costs.

A feverish race has been on with naval expenditures during the past 5 years, of which the United States contributed \$1,832,718,022, to which we are asked further to build a billion dollar parity navy, for more American battleships to be used in naval target practice. Obsolete \$40,000,000 battleships, Mitchell, airman, declared might be sunk with a single bomb, but they make good targets and furnish large profits to shipbuilders. And in this mad race for war expenditures taxpayers have no voice or consideration.

MUNITION MAKERS INSPIRE WAR PROPAGANDA

No President can resist the direct pressure of his close Army and Navy advisers, reinforced by powerful financial interests that find many reasons to advance for war excepting reasons of self and profit, potent in every war.

The munition maker is our first line of offense marching with Army and Navy high officials when war is proposed. The voiceless millions who will be conscripted to fight, how are they to be heard? Not one voice can be raised without the charge of "opposed to national defense." That is found in every country in the world, and the poor pawns are later thrown into the scrap-heap of war. They neither exercise any voice for war or are able to resist service. In a great world democracy war dictatorship is supreme.

David scattered the Philistines with a single stone, which slew their leader, but under the modern code hundreds, yes thousands, of trainloads and shiploads of war munitions are sold annually to destroy life and make profits for war lords. That is the financial interest of these war propagandists; and the individual soldier, multiplied by millions, is ground out of existence, with a wooden cross for his marker, in making profits. That war issue is more important than any other question. There is not a mother or father in this hall, nor a child in the country, not interested in the effect on them of threatened war and the danger of our being thrown into war by propaganda. Not "danger" alone, practical certainty based on opinions quoted.

Munition makers and others overwhelm the President with the necessity for resenting some alleged insult to our national honor. The President when persuaded, though elected 6 months before because he kept us out of war, then tells Congress what to do, and Congress always yields to the clamor by surrendering to propaganda with its "declaration of war." Read the debates prior to the last war vote in view of subsequent events with the oft-repeated cry, "stand by the President." He with Congress is subjected to deception when war hysteria reigns.

Selfish and ambitious interests feed on fears, pressed on the public by propaganda carefully nurtured by Navy leagues, munition makers, American War Lord Northcliffs, and like influences, leaving the public bewildered and helpless. A picture of internationalism is presented that seeks to lead the world, whereas the great mass of our people are for noninterference, peaceful settlements, without desire for territory, revenge, commercial advantages or pelf, the aim of warring nations. Until we overcome these un-American war agencies no permanent business recovery is possible in this country or in the world, for rumors and false alarms are the tools in trade of the propagandist.

Personal reasons for the war vote are apart from merits of this discussion. However, arguments pro and con, knowledge of feuds and military rivalries centuries old, involving balance of power in Europe, boasts of arrogant goose-stepping officers, and other influences, were all deemed trivial compared with horrors of war offered our people who had no voice in the decision. Foreign alliances were believed perilous to this Government and its people,

fraught with unlimited future dangers. Without criticizing judgment of others, responsibility for action was not influenced by childish cries of pro this or pro that, but by an abiding faith in pro-Americanism.

It requires far more courage to fight foes from within urging war than those from without and based on all our history, the oratory and arguments that demand warlike preparations are not the voice of the people who are to be butchered by bombs, machine guns, and murderous gases. Now that wars invite extermination alike of helpless women and children, public attention is guided away from war's results by holding up the elastic time-worn cry for "national defense", a defense that has already caused America to shoulder upward of 80 percent of normal tax burdens for its wars to date. When looking for causes of depression and war burdens, do not forget that the ledger is always on the red side when war comes.

KNOWN LIABILITIES RECEIVED FROM THE WORLD WAR

Our present shocking reign of crime follows and comes through the last war. That war encouraged frauds and profiteering in Government, countenanced lying propaganda, promoted wild national and individual extravagance, taught that violence, force, and wrong-doing could justify ends, including legalized killing and slaughter. It did all this under a plea of developing manhood, courage, and character in defense of national honor and making the world a safe place to live in.

We reaped a whirlwind of crime that follows every war and nowhere in the civilized world are statistics of lawlessness comparable to ours. It brought repudiation of \$11,000,000,000 loaned to our "allies", as stated, to be shouldered onto American taxpayers. Apart from wide-spread misery, loss of life, property, and ideals, that was our substantial return from the last war. Will we repeat? What is to prevent when a President elected because he kept us out of war, can put us in war? The people who pay should decide and not Presidents who, through a subservient Congress, will all be swept off their feet by false war propaganda. That is the problem. How to prevent war lords from forcing us into another war to end wars.

During the war our chaplains pray with fervor to the same God for success in arms that our enemies' chaplains beg to, and with equal fervor, while victors and vanquished alike are crushed under this modern juggernaut of war. Those offering discussions of approaching war and possible preventives are pointed out as "pacifists" and placed on the defense when valiant generals and admirals and would-be military authorities, rarely in many miles of danger, loudly shout for our national honor and for another "war to end wars."

NO PRIDE IN MILITARY ACTIVITIES NOR A PACIFIST

I have no pride in any personal or family military record, but speak from an experience of many years in military service, of which 5 were spent in the Regular Army and a company raised and offered for war service. A direct ancestor was killed leading his company in the Revolution. A father and son each served throughout one of the last two great wars as volunteers in active service at the front; so I understand what war means.

I speak feelingly also because the Thirty-second Division of Wisconsin and Michigan troops in the World War suffered 13,000 casualties, and nearly one half of the entire force was disabled, and a small company from my home city lost 88 men, killed or died in France. That is "war", and that little company lost more lives in battle during the war than the entire American Navy, which is constantly on dress parade in pictures fanning the war spirit for future conflicts.

Naval officers and sailors are presumably equally brave, but private soldiers in front and rear rank were mowed down by machine guns, while admirals and seamen walking their decks, high Army experts far from danger, and powerful war advocates who held foreign securities were never found among the dead or missing. The humble "private" sacrificed life—his most valued possession—while these others enjoyed safety, alike dear to them.

That is the system I knew, a system I voted against along with Leader Kitchin, Keating, and General Sherwood in Congress, the latter a great soldier who started as a "private", and through 40 battles in the Civil War won his "star" by fighting. When war was declared, all joined to win. That is the only course when once in war.

Any arms embargo is usually protested by military and naval authorities and by munition manufacturers. That is their business, while admirals and other officers sometimes hold stocks in powder, arms, and other companies that will be affected by war. Every munition maker naturally is with the lobby and propaganda which demand unrestricted sales to all combatants. Let me give another picture of their influence on war.

ELEVEN BILLION DOLLARS GUARANTEED AMERICAN MUNITION MAKERS

I stated in the House when the arms embargo proposal was before Congress this year, that money we loaned our Allies (since largely repudiated), and approximately \$11,000,000,000 in amount was raised by American taxpayers to pay American manufacturers for furnishing war supplies to European nations. The United States taxpayers thus paid American manufacturers who provided munitions for the Allies in addition to vast expenditures made by our own Government in that same war for our armies. That was a prize and price of war. Eleven billion dollars was the prize sought and won by American munition makers. Won by our entrance in the war. Lost to them if we kept out. They helped put us in as has been shown.

What peace power could combat the greed and avarice of men who had \$11,000,000,000 sure money awaiting them if our country

was thrown into that war whirlpool? Sold at double peace-time prices and more, their enormous profits warranted unlimited expenditures for war propaganda. International securities were also involved among motives for our war entrance; but we saw a President, just elected because he kept us out of war, practically demand from Congress a declaration of war because of mistaken facts he read to us, which I have presented to the House on different occasions, with Secretary Lansing's correction of facts.

War propaganda knows to the full a mob psychology that reaches alike from the layman to the clergy. It causes men to see red, become insane, and lose all reasoning power. Recovery brings sorrow and suffering, sure to follow such appeals to force. When in passion, the individual kills. When uncontrolled rage occurs, the people voice legalized killing by war. The propagandist knows that fact and plays on their emotions and prejudices in gaining results. That occurs with every war, but the people should decide if war is to come, for they do the fighting. It is comparatively easy to center propaganda on Congress. It would be resisted and overcome by a people whose rights to peace and safety through a plebiscite would aid their judgment.

PROFITS IN WAR CONTRACTS UNLIMITED IN WAR

In urging limitation of profits with war contracts and war production, a recent war commission, headed by ex-Secretary of War Hurley, reported, based on evidence of his chief of staff, that no manufacturer should make over 6 percent on any Government contract during the war.

The advice of generals and a Secretary of War in taking the profits out of war contracts is interesting to those who know such course to be impossible even though solemn resolutions by veteran soldier organizations are also to the same effect. Every member of the Committee of Fifteen that investigated the World War contracts believes to the contrary, and I was a member of that committee. However desirable, it is only a matter for moot discussion.

When in war all laws are suspended, including the Constitution. Whatever the cause of war, once in, the war must be won, and in every threatened country, particularly our own, where private business controls the Government's war munitions and war operations, the limit of profits has been and always will be the sky during war as long as profits remain in the hands of private parties.

The Shipping Board squandered billions of dollars without providing service ships during 19 months of war. Congress spent over a half billion without producing one war plane spent through our aircraft experts and other American "war experts." History will repeat profits and blunders, and hundreds of useless warships now rusting and rotting in our yards at Philadelphia, San Diego, and elsewhere, will be doubled and tripled without result except to disclose the monumental folly of war experts. Contracts by the Government for public works and public material even in peace times are suspiciously noncompetitive. In war no pretense of cost and price relationship exists.

After a profound 6-percent-profit finding, the recent War Commission agreed that the precedent established of conscripting men for war shall be a fixture in our future war operations. The youth of the land will be subjected to a "selective" draft automatically when war comes. That is the only recommendation sure of enforcement. Guaranties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are set aside in the same Constitution by those who pretend profits can be curbed when the Nation's life is at stake.

Presidents should be given power to declare an embargo against arms shipments to all combatants when we are not directly involved. Such power has been given to President Roosevelt during the recent session. It is one step to prevent war. It was opposed strongly on the floor of the House. I supported it because I believed he should have the power, and he received it, but it is no insurance against war. War prevention, however, is largely in our own hands, if we will exercise it by permitting a prewar plebiscite by the people.

In days of war propaganda, of false reports deliberately circulated to arouse war hysteria, it is difficult now to awaken the American people in time to prevent us from joining the next mad war game. If the press could be compelled by law to carry a statement of facts from the President, then the people should be the ones to determine by a plebiscite if war is to be declared. Surely men to be thrown into the trenches and those depending on them for a livelihood should have a voice if war is to come.

When war is on, nothing is too good for our "defenders"; but soon they are forgotten, pensions cut off, and the poor human who was seized by the coat collar and thrust into war at a dollar a day, risking his health and life, is often thrown into the scrap heap, judging from recent happenings. Every Member is deluged with protests today from veterans who believed promises would be fulfilled by a grateful Nation. If frauds in individual cases occurred, it is grossly unjust to take the executioner's ax with a million or more cases as it would be to invalidate all Government contracts because a small percentage was found fraudulent. We did not hesitate to promise reward when sending the boy to fight in France. He went on orders. No justification can ever be offered for the distress and suffering caused by the ruthless cancellation of these pensions.

A SURE WAY TO AVOID NEEDLESS WAR—WILL WE ACT IN TIME?

For three sessions I have introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution that, if passed, would give the people the right to determine whether our country could be involved in foreign wars.

Under the Constitution, the President, as Commander in Chief, can send every man and woman, if need be, to the front to defend

against any invader. Twenty million selected, able-bodied men, and double that number if need be, could be sent by the President to our borders to defend against all the armies of the world that might be brought against us. Only a fraction of that number would ever combine against us, because of certain defeat and inability to combine.

In 19 months of war, as previously stated, an expenditure of over a half billion dollars for airplanes was largely wasted without obtaining one American battle plane during the last war. Many other billions were practically wasted by "war experts" and dollar-a-day men during war.

A comparatively reasonable sum properly expended would provide us with many thousands of fighting planes and an army of flyers with which to defend our borders from all foes that could be marshaled against us. A \$40,000,000 battleship alone keeps men working on a discarded, obsolete war weapon, but even that amount spent for defensive airplanes would furnish 2,000 or more protectors that could not be matched by invaders. Ten times that amount would willingly be expended if need be, but parity-navy propaganda to equal England's Navy is without reason or result excepting to profit war contractors and shipbuilders at the expense of taxpayers and aid other nations that will again ask us to help when threatened by war. Every shipbuilder and munitions maker favors a "parity navy." That is their business.

In Russia, Italy, Germany, and practically every other country, a government censorship is exercised over the press that reaches suspension, if need be, when war is under consideration. Any effort to limit propaganda with us is construed to mean restriction of the liberty of the press even when war is being considered. Sensational reports are then published to arouse men to the fighting pitch and fan war flames to incite mob action. That is one easy avenue for propaganda. The radio, movies, and other publicity agencies are impossible to overcome when combined to force a war declaration from Congress. For that reason alone it is well to seek protection from war in advance and exercise by law punishment for willful false propaganda.

Time prevents consideration of such propaganda control or how to be exercised in our own country. I have introduced in several successive sessions of Congress the following proposed amendment to the Constitution that may not excite popular attention because not given to prowar sensationalism but would be effective. It reads:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 103

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Congress shall have power to declare war only after the war proposition shall have been submitted by the President to the several States and a majority of the States at general or special elections called by the governors thereof shall have approved the same. This amendment shall not be construed to prevent the President from using the Army and Navy to suppress insurrections and to repel invasions.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons shall not be violated by conscription or forced military service, but when public safety demands Congress may provide for forced military service on the North American Continent and in no other place."

I am not interested in the phraseology but only in the purpose and scope.

Its terms are sweeping; but if liberty of speech and press is part of our Constitution, so is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to the individual who under modern war methods can be taken from his plow or shop and thrust into foreign trenches to fight more foreign wars. That would be largely prevented by passage of this amendment, for the ease with which Congress always swings into a declaration of war would be hampered if the people who pay the piper are permitted to speak at the polls. They would never have voted for recent wars in which we have been engaged and we may judge the future by the past.

WHAT BETTER PLAN TO PREVENT WAR IS OFFERED?

If the press for 30 days were required to publish arguments for and against war as offered by a President's message to Congress, and at the end of 30 days an election held in every State where the people could exercise their franchise, this would be safer than to leave our national life in the hands of irresponsible war agencies and paid propaganda that profits by deliberate misrepresentation.

When we reach a sane method of handling war threats, we will prevent useless foreign wars to end wars. Every man is subject to call to prevent invasion or insurrection, but that is not affected by the proposed amendment.

As it stands today we are liable to be injected into any war. The President was quoted by a French writer as saying that we are not going to interfere with any foreign wars. Who is going to be the next President, and would another one tell Congress to declare war within 6 months after his election because he kept us out of war? The only safe proposition for the American people who pay the debts and furnish the troops is the right to decide. The boys who are to fight should also have voice.

LET ME REPEAT, ALL INFLUENCES ON CONGRESS ARE FOR WAR WHEN
PROPAGANDA DEMANDS

I have not dwelt upon the horrors of war. I have been over battlefields of the Spanish-American War, down to the Philippines, and over the battlefields of the Civil War and of many in Europe. My father was in that Civil War for 3 years and 4 months. I have not dwelt upon the pitiful pleas to Congress against wars, by mothers whose sole support was taken because of their boys' belief that war would be a long holiday; of brave parents who tried to find solace for a vacant chair in the household by a gold star; of appeals to Congress to end the war, impossible when once in, or to get their boys home; of crippled youths in the springtime of life, of long struggles when pensions were cut off and veterans with their loved ones thrown on public charity.

Three war cases were sent to me recently in 1 day. All pleading gross injustice by the Government. One man showed me his twisted foot. "They have cut off my pension and got me and my family down to \$8"; \$8 for a man who cannot work because he is a cripple because of that disability! Veterans kicked out by those who too soon forgot.

New youths and a new generation will soon come upon the scene, and the past will be forgotten as the glittering bauble of war's lure is again painted in false, attractive colors by those who never fight but send others to fight; who profit with the greed of Shylock over the pound of flesh in millions of homes. These are part of a nightmare that left its impress on Members of the war Congress and during many sessions that followed.

In the most serious problem of all problems that face the people of this country and other countries today, a problem to be determined not by the people but by self-appointed war lords, we will in all probability again be called upon to bear war's burdens, possibly heavier than ever before. Without shrinking from the decision, I am presenting to you a preventive against needless wars and for the preservation of a civilization that experts declare may be wiped out by our failure to act in time.

I thank you.

[The members arose and applauded.]

President LA ROCCA. I am sure that the subject which Congressman FREAR has discussed before this Congress is necessarily a very great problem, and for his helpful advice we are all truly grateful.

A CERTAIN REMEDY AVAILABLE

Mr. FREAR. The foregoing address, made over 4 months ago, is self-explanatory. The situation has become more critical, as will be noted from other data herewith appended. The remedy first. Less than 1 week ago, President Roosevelt on December 28, at the Wilson dinner, gave utterance to a naked truth when he said that "political leaders, not their peoples, threaten the peace of the world." That being true, the only guaranty of peace is a pre-war plebiscite which permits the peoples to determine when war shall come. In this movement and emergency Roosevelt can lead the world by giving to the peoples of the United States right to set an example to the world. No better insurance can be had against "scraps of paper" that compose worthless peace treaties and equally worthless European debt pledges; no better protection against savage warfare and its boon companions—crime and vice—has been proposed. It is the best solution offered to protect the people against selfish individualism because it puts faith and trust in that people who must decide.

Any President who advocates that proposal will endear himself to his people and to the entire world more than by any political move or economic experiment, however promising.

HOW AND WHEN WAR THREATENS—LISTEN TO SECRETARY BAKER'S
PREDICTION, SECONDED BY FRANK SIMONDS AND OTHER WAR
EXPERTS

Following my address given last August before the Fraternal Congress of America, brief extracts from prior speeches in the House made on the same general subject gives corroborating evidence referred to in the Milwaukee address. Also extract from statement of Ex-Secretary of War Baker, given December 1, 1933, scarcely 30 days ago. I quote from the Associated Press report:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, December 2, 1933.—When the next war comes it will be almost impossible for the United States not to become involved, Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, told the Foreign Affairs Council here yesterday. * * * The former Secretary of War said the world is living in a powder magazine, and some are walking about with steel and others with flint.

In other words, this high authority during our last war announces war will come and it is "almost impossible for the United States not to become involved" again. That testimony supplements words of Secretary of State Hull,

Morgenthau, Simonds, and others previously quoted. European war threats are practically undisputed. Mr. Baker is familiar with influences that precipitate wars, and no man is better qualified to speak. He is conservative, and from my acquaintance with him in 1917-18 when war was on, every question by him was resolved in favor of Army Staff decisions for, as he said, he "had to depend upon the staff to win the war." That super military power will be exercised when war comes again, and again all-controlling voice in the world's greatest democracy will be that of war generals.

Mr. Baker was an outstanding candidate for the Presidency last campaign. His position, if in the Executive chair, can be understood by past history, and without criticism, I say he presents no method of war avoidance. If "steel and flint" clash, as threatens, then the President and Congress again will be overwhelmed with propaganda, whether true or false in character. As stated in congressional debate in 1917, not 10 percent of the people who fight and pay want war, and if given an opportunity they would vote against war and against sending conscripted American boys to fight in the "powder magazines" of Europe.

During recent years I have, as stated repeatedly, offered a resolution in Congress giving this country the right to a plebiscite on war before Congress is again swept off its feet by powerful war agencies. That resolution is now before Congress. Every Representative of the people is responsible for his acts; but when war threatens, Congress is unable to resist the tremendous pressure that follows. Again I submit that a plebiscite should be given to the people by constitutional right before Congress declares war and that no American soldiers be conscripted again to fight in Europe's powderhouse.

VALUE OF SHEARER IN DEFEATING PEACE PROPOSALS

Evidence of war-propaganda methods is found on every hand. A few days ago financial results of Shearer's methods at Geneva were placed on our desks in the following news item. Others to the same effect are before me, but merely cumulative:

SHEARER'S EMPLOYERS GET NAVAL CONTRACTS

[From "International Traffic in Arms and Ammunition", by William T. Stone, Foreign Policy Association Report, Aug. 16, 1933]

The three private companies which were involved in the Shearer case—Bethlehem, Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., and New York Shipbuilding Co.—have divided among themselves most of the naval construction carried out in private yards for the United States Government in recent years. Of the sixteen 8-inch-gun cruisers laid down between 1926 and 1932, 3 were built by the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, 4 by the New York Shipbuilding Co., and 2 by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.; the others were built in navy yards. These firms have just been awarded contracts for 13 of the 21 war vessels to be built in private yards under the 1933 naval program, financed in large part from public-works funds. The value of these contracts is approximately \$100,000,000 apportioned among the three firms as follows: Bethlehem, 1 heavy cruiser, 4 destroyers, \$27,304,000; New York Shipbuilding Co., 2 light cruisers, 4 destroyers, \$37,454,000; Newport News, 2 aircraft carriers, \$38,000,000. Four smaller firms were awarded the remaining eight vessels—destroyers and submarines—at a total contract price of approximately \$24,000,000. * * *

Washington was visited about a month ago by a former member of the English Parliament who fearlessly denounced the arms makers who bring on wars. These companies are the only ones to my knowledge paying extra dividends today. I quote Brockway, on November 30, in support of Colonel Drew and others as to war propagandists:

ARMS MAKERS CALLED MENACE—THEY SUBSIDIZE JINGOISM, BRITISH
LABOR LEADER CHARGES HERE

Munitions makers subsidize patriotic organizations to create world markets, A. Fenner Brockway, leader of the British Independent Labor Party, told an audience at Washington Mount Pleasant Congregational Church last night.

The former member of Parliament charged five international companies control the world's armament business and constitute a "sinister force drawing the nations of the world into conflict."

Chief aids to munitions manufacturers in finding markets are patriotic groups, which are subsidized to foment war, Brockway asserted. The only effective check to this gigantic conspiracy against world peace, he said, would be abolition of all armaments.

The international aspect of the world-wide munitions conspiracy was stressed by the labor spokesman, who said Hitler now is buy-

ing arms from French concerns, that French, British, and American armies used German weapons and barbed wire in the World War, and that Armstrong-Vickers, Ltd., of England, supplied the cannon and the shells which mowed down British at the Dardanelles.

BIG ARMIES AND BIG NAVIES INVITE WAR

Within 30 days from placing this recital of war activities in the RECORD I quote the temper of other nations over our own war preparations. Human nature is ever the same as the war supply agencies well know. Here is one report, hardly a week old, from the Washington Post:

LONDON, December 26.—Aroused by reports its naval strength has been outstripped by the United States and Japan, Great Britain, the belief is growing here, is preparing to launch a large naval-building program in 1934. Larger and more heavily armed cruisers than originally projected, antisubmarine craft, and more airplanes are on the way to comply with treaty terms. * * *

Also, from Japan:

Japan's 1934 budget of \$633,600,000 apportions \$281,400,000 for its army and navy, the largest amount in history.

This latter total that alarms news writers and war lords is about 25 percent of a total to be expended by the United States for the same purpose during the same period. With one breath we pledge nonintervention against other nations and then expect them to ignore our war preparations.

Every session of Congress finds both Army and Navy demanding greater appropriations for "National defense." "Preparedness" is the slogan of the staff and Navy League and, last but not least, munition makers. Russia began hostilities and contributed 12,000,000 in mobilized forces in the World War. Germany, the home of "preparedness", followed Russia with 11,000,000 men. France, that demanded back Alsace-Lorraine through war, followed with 8,410,000 men. All were "prepared."

Over half of the forces engaged in the World War and over half of the casualties were furnished by three governments ruled by the Czar, Kaiser, and also the war party of France, the first to repudiate its debt to us. Preparedness does not prevent war; it invites and challenges war.

Before calling attention to recent Naval and Army Staffs appeal for a big navy and big army based on per capita and other misleading estimates, I ask your reading of a well-timed article written by Assistant Secretary of War Woodring, apparently to quiet apprehension of Congress, on that same subject, and not poisoned by the usual propaganda that greets every session. Coming from official sources, the Secretary says:

Our Army is the only branch of the Government which is already organized and available not only to defend our territory but also to cope with social and economic problems in an emergency.

That message and several pages of testimony found in the magazine Liberty of January 6, 1934, comes to the country like a breath of fresh air amid usual fumes of war-preparedness propaganda emitted by war agencies named, aided effectively by munition forces that alike profit by wars.

During the last war China, with 1,922,000 organized forces, Japan with practically the same, and Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands with two million or more wisely kept out of the direct fire. The United States got in. Those entitled to the credit and responsibility should accept it. History repeats, for a big army and navy wants active service and that means war.

After waiting until the \$1,000,000 parity Navy program was fairly started, the Army Staff, as usual, about 30 days ago, suddenly informed Congress that the Army strength is below the danger line. This announcement is expected to startle the legislative body, but a seventeenth place reported in the sisterhood of nations is subject to explanation, or else the red flag of danger has been so long in coming that the Staff is dangerously remiss in its duty.

HOW LARGE IS OUR ARMY NOW?

Let us get a true slant as to the reported seventeenth place of our military forces because of a reputed force of only 113,000 men, claimed by the Staff, which number, if true, however, is four or five times our Army strength of

20 years ago. The World Almanac 1933 gives the active Regular force and trained Reserve a total force of 439,189; a large peace Army.

In a recent speech in the House, Hon. ROSS A. COLLINS, Chairman of the Army Appropriations Subcommittee, gives the enlisted strength of the so-called "Regular Army" 118,750, officers 12,000, Philippine Scouts 6,000, and a few additional officers, in addition to "about 60,000 civilians" assigned to various activities in the Army. Counting these, he reports the Regular Army has a total strength on Government rolls of 198,555.

To the above force, however, he adds that the bill then before Congress provided funds for 190,000 National Guardsmen of whom 13,966 were officers and that the program called for 435,000 men, the number authorized in the National Defense Act.

Representative COLLINS estimated the cost per year for the National Guard at \$55,000,000. To this force he adds 114,804 commissioned officers and 5,416 enlisted men in the Organized Reserves, sufficient to supply an army of 3,500,000 men. Again he adds 127,141 young men in the Reserve officers' training camp. Counting the various military training activities to which the Federal Government contributes, around 500,000 men and youths are receiving military training. Vast annual Army appropriations support this "force".

Representative COLLINS (chairman of the Army Appropriations Subcommittee) on January 10, 1931, informed the House that in the Army bill for 1932, then reported, it provided for 211,749 Regular Army personnel, 195,000 additional men and officers in the National Guard, 106,103 additional officers and enlisted men in Organized Reserves, 37,500 additional citizens in military training camps, 131,033 additional Reserve officers' training camp, 110,529 National Rifle Board. This totals over 600,000 officers and men receiving military instruction entirely or partially supported by the Federal Government. The Army Staff failed to mention these other military bodies. Accidental forgetfulness is a serious offense, even in a soldier, and much more in an officer.

SIXTEEN YEARS IN REGULARS AND GUARD GIVES EXPERIENCE

The National Guard, for illustration, was ordered to the front among the first troops in the World War. The Wisconsin and Michigan National Guard made up the fine Thirty-second Division, including my old regiment that suffered 13,000 casualties or over 50 percent of its effective force. The French in praise called them "Les Terribles." Jones, war correspondent, in the New York Times, said:

One village changed hands nine times in the bitter contest between these boys from Wisconsin and Michigan and the German Jaegers and Prussian Guards. The title of "Les Terribles" has been bestowed on this division by the French.

I am quoting from speech made in the House in September 1918.

My son was with that division, which was used by the staff as "shock troops." The company I organized many years ago came out of that fight with 30 men in charge of a mess sergeant, according to the same speech made in the House on September 23, 1918. That explains the following brief extract from several pages of hearings by the War Policies Commission occurring in May 1931:

Secretary of War HURLEY. Do you know the size of the Regular Army now?

Mr. FREAR. About 200,000 * * *

Secretary of War HURLEY. The Regular Army is 118,000.

Mr. COLLINS. It is about 126,000.

Mr. FREAR. Is not the National Guard under the jurisdiction of the Regular Army?

Secretary HURLEY. Not completely so * * *. It would take action to bring it under the Army.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I know. I served 11 years in the Wisconsin National Guard.

Secretary HURLEY. And I am sure I served longer than that.

Mr. FREAR. I also served 5 years in the Regular Army before that.

Secretary of War HURLEY. I don't think that affects what I have in mind.

Mr. FREAR. It does, because the National Guard is a part of the Regular Army in all respects in case of war. They are certain to be ordered among the first.

Secretary HURLEY. They are certain to be, but not until an act of Congress makes it possible.

Mr. FREAR. Do you contend that any Congress would not pass such an act?

Secretary HURLEY. No.

The National Guard was and always will be in the first line in time of war, nor will any Secretary of War deny that fact.

Six hundred thousand officers and men with military training, taking Chairman COLLINS' figures, is a large army if activities are confined to this continent instead of helping to settle Europe's next war to end wars. For defense it could be easily enlarged to many millions, but no foe would be able to get any foothold on our own continent. It requires no war expert to know this fact, though irresponsible propagandists rave about the possibility of foreign invasions. It never has occurred since 1814, over a century ago, when we declared war in 1812 against England, the last to invade. Scareheads and war propaganda demand preparedness in every country, but no people have spent as extravagantly for national defense as ours, and no people are as safe and free from invasion as our own. I have submitted undeniable testimony on that subject.

Would you know something of secret treaties in Europe that bring on war and explain Russia's haste to help France in 1914? I quote from my speech in the RECORD, December 7, 1929:

SECRET TREATY OBLIGATIONS

Back in 1893 Russia and France were so alarmed over the attitude of Germany, Austria, and Italy that a secret treaty was drawn, providing, among other terms, that—

"If France is attacked by Germany or by Italy, supported by Germany, Russia will employ all her forces to attack Germany. If Russia is attacked by Germany or by Austria supported by Germany, France will employ all her forces to combat Germany."

"The forces to be employed against Germany will be, on the part of France, 1,300,000 men; on the part of Russia, 700,000 to 800,000. These forces will engage with all their might so that Germany has to fight on the east and west."

"All the clauses will be kept rigorously secret. (Gooch, p. 183, History of Modern Europe.)"

THE FRUITS OF WAR

This is not news in 1929, nor was the prediction by Gooch that thereafter Europe was divided into two armed camps and entered on the path that led straight to the catastrophe of 1914. The secret treaty of 1893 was not disclosed until 1918, long after America's 4,727,988 men had participated in the war and shortly before the conclusion of war. Instead of 800,000 Russians "employed", the number of Russian casualties alone reached 9,150,000 out of 12,000,000 soldiers engaged in the war, and instead of 1,300,000 from France, the French casualties alone reached 6,160,800 out of 8,410,000 engaged, with total casualties of all belligerents reaching a stupendous figure of more than 37,000,000 out of 65,000,000 men engaged. No man ever estimated the countless widows and orphans, bitter fruit of that conflict.

Secret treaties, whether kept or "scraps of paper", do not prevent wars, but on the contrary often bring on wars. We follow blindly that secret-treaty leadership, and, according to war experts, are inevitably sure to do so again.

Would you have a sidelight on propaganda by international tricksters that brought on the American World War declaration by Congress? I quote briefly from my speech in the RECORD of February 26, 1931:

MR. NORTHCLIFFE'S METHODS

On page 163, Bent, in his books on press methods, says significantly in relation to the World War:

"Pomeroy Burton, managing director of Northcliffe's London Mail, came to the United States to address the advertising bureau of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and told its members how to use the advertising columns in the emergency by printing in them day after day and week after week patriotic appeals to the people calculated to stimulate their war spirit."

"Keep the war spirit there first, last, and all the time." Bent significantly concludes that this advice—prior to the World War—became the program. If that statement is substantially true, what of the responsibility of Congress for permitting unchallenged these conditions, when Bent adds:

"The effect of war on the press makes it the subservient channel of propaganda often wholly untrue. It is a quality of propaganda that, like bribery, stultifies him who gives as well as him who receives it. It closes the minds of both to truth, encourages arrogance, and engenders intolerance."

What can be added to this arraignment of the press by a writer who literally offers hundreds of examples of press propaganda methods?

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESS FOR WAR

The war to end wars forced us into that struggle only after more than 30 months of trench fighting by Europeans which often re-

sembled a stalemate. Wilson did not want to declare war. He was elected in the November previous because he kept us out of war. The Republican platform of 1916 said specifically:

"We desire peace, the peace of justice and right, and believe in maintaining a strict and honest neutrality between the belligerents in the Great War in Europe. * * * We believe in the pacific settlement of international disputes and favor the establishment of a world court for that purpose."

Yet, within a few months after that solemn pronouncement the pressure of the press and interests that urged war were too great to withstand by either Wilson or Congress, and both yielded to that pressure.

Wilson sought to avoid the whirlpool. Finally he, too, capitulated, and his message to Congress demanded in no uncertain terms that Congress should do that which under the Constitution it had the sole power and right to do—declare war. The President in effect declared war and Congress consented. These matters I have discussed heretofore at length.

Quoting from a speech in the RECORD of January 19, 1932, is a sample of the mistaken information voiced by President Wilson, later disputed by Lansing, that helped swing Wilson and Congress into war:

I quote briefly from House proceeding of April 5, 1917, immediately before the declaration by Congress for war. I am not discussing the merits of the last war. That is water over the wheel, but I am presenting influences that always surround Congress when a war declaration is presented.

Uncle Joe Cannon, out of a 44-year service, then said regarding Presidential influence, page 343, April 5:

"Under the Constitution the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy * * *. The House is one part of the legislative body. Presidents have made conditions time and again that have forced the legislative body to declare war. Mr. Polk was the first one."

PRESIDENTS FORCE CONGRESS INTO WARS

Practically every war declaration by Congress, including the last one, has been so influenced by the President. In other words, the President produces a situation that Congress cannot resist. Throughout the speeches for a war declaration in 1917 ran the cry by Members and laymen, iterated and reiterated, "Stand by the President!" That I wish briefly to discuss, without reflection upon President Wilson, who was elected 6 months before for keeping us out of war. Under the present system, he, like Congress, is ever subjected to a flood of war propaganda hard to determine in its truth or falsity, or responsible interest, a pressure equally hard to resist during war hysteria.

Congressman Cooper, of Wisconsin, dean of the House, read on April 5, 1917, to the House from President Wilson's message to Congress:

"Let me remind the Congress that on the 18th of April (1916) last, in view of the sinking on the 24th of March of the steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of lives of several citizens of the United States, who were passengers aboard her—"

And so forth.

In predicating a duty of Congress to declare war, the President gave as a determining reason therefor, among others, the loss of lives of Americans sailing on the North Sea—in the war zone—and in face of warnings by belligerents of that danger. The President believed that statement of losses to be true. It was not true, for Congressman Cooper read extracts from a letter dated March 27, 1917, or only 10 days before the declaration of war was passed, which contained the following:

"You are informed that no American citizens lost their lives on the *Sussex* and *Evelyn*."

"Very sincerely yours,

"ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State."

That letter appears in full in the RECORD of April 5, 1917. A misinformed President, with all the power and influence of his position, urged upon Congress as a cause for war a reason that did not exist. A reason, even if true, that alone should not have caused the loss of 100,000 American lives and \$35,000,000,000 war expenditures because of venturesome or reckless American travelers. Only war's hysteria made it impossible to resist. It was found to be untrue, as stated by Lansing.

Like the sinking of the *Maine* in Havana Harbor, such reports will always stir national anger, whether the facts and responsibility therefor are true or not. Future wars are certain to result from like reports. Emotional insanity should not plunge the people into wars. It will not do so if they decide. A leading Democratic Member, Congressman Keating, during the heated war debate, page 343, RECORD, April 5, aptly expressed the feeling of the country when he said:

"I ask Members of the House who among you last October and November, when asking votes from your constituents, dared suggest to them that if elected you would send their boys to Europe? Why, my friends, Woodrow Wilson, running on that kind of a platform, would not have carried a single State in this Union."

Six months before President Wilson had been reelected "because he kept us out of war." Yet, within that 6 months we were in.

NOT ONE PERSON IN TEN WOULD HAVE VOTED FOR WAR

Congressman BRITTEN, a present leading member of the Naval Committee, page 397, April 5, 1917, declared:

"I have traveled over the great Central West, and I tell you sincerely that 90 percent of the people of this country are opposed to the declaration of war against Germany at this time. The truth is that 90 percent of your people and mine do not want this declaration of war, and are distinctly opposed to our going into that bloody mire on the other side."

Mr. BRITTEN then offered an amendment to the war declaration, as follows:

"Provided, however, That no part of the military forces of the United States shall be ordered to do land duty in any part of Europe, Asia, or Africa until so directed by Congress, excepting those troops who specifically volunteer for such service."

The amendment was defeated.

Among many impressive words in debate on that same day, I quote from Representative Sherwood (Democrat), a lovable man, who enlisted in the Civil War as a private. He was in 42 engagements and battles, promoted repeatedly for bravery, and finally mustered out of that war, with a brilliant record second to none, as a brigadier general.

No more courageous man ever represented his countrymen in Congress. He said, page 335, April 5:

"I cannot keep faith with my people by voting for this war resolution in its present form. I will vote for it if the provision to authorize an army to be sent across the Atlantic to participate in this European conflict is stricken out."

I quote from Representative Keating, who gave a correct picture of the responsibility of Congress in sending others to fight when he said in debate, page 348, the same day:

CONGRESSMEN DO NOT CROWD RECRUITING STATIONS

"When Congress declares war, it does not mean that Congressmen are ordered to the front. Congress has declared war heretofore, but the recruiting offices of this country have not been uncomfortably crowded with Senators and Representatives who wanted to enlist."

CLAUDE KITCHIN'S WAR STATEMENT

One of the bravest men in that war Congress, and one of the ablest, was Democratic Leader Claude Kitchin, who also broke with his President on the war declaration. In a paragraph he sounded a message to the country that will be true of any other European war in which we engage. He said, in debate, on page 333:

"We are about to make the cause of Great Britain, France, and Russia, right or wrong, our cause. We are to make their quarrel our quarrel. We are to help fight with all the resources in men, money, and credit a difference between the belligerents of Europe, to which we were and are utter strangers."

That is true of every European war.

My proposed constitutional amendment meets the criticism of leading Members in that war debate by its submission to a plebiscite as urged in effect by Britten and Keating and prevention of conscription for European wars as urged by General Sherwood, Democratic Leader Kitchin, and Britten and others.

This same procedure will occur if my resolution is adopted. It is the only preventive of war that will give to the people, power to decide.

Would you know what President Wilson learned we got out of the World War? I quote further from speech of January 19, 1932:

The following extract with brief comment is from a White House secretary, who was with President Wilson and Mrs. Wilson following the war. At that time the war poker game was being played by Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando, with the President of the United States seeking to learn the mysteries of European war treaties.

Her information must be accurate, because it has never been denied, and appeared in the October 1930 Cosmopolitan, about which I commented at some length in the RECORD of January 9, 1931. On page 1825 of the RECORD she says:

"After luncheon the President (Wilson) told us of an amusing quarrel between Clemenceau and Lloyd George. The question of mandatories for Asia Minor was being discussed, and as Italy had shown bad faith, they did not want her to have any part therein. The French want northern Anatolia, the British southern, and they want the United States to take Armenia. The French felt they were not being treated fairly.

"Yesterday he (the President) sat on a chair while Lloyd George and Clemenceau renewed again * * * their fight of the day before. The President (of the United States) was constituted umpire, and he said it was fun to watch the two pointing out plans on the map and to hear one saying to the other, 'You promised us this or that in Asia Minor for this thing or the other', and he sat there quite out of sympathy or understanding of the bargaining away of peoples.

"Last night Clemenceau attempted a curious thing. The treaty was being printed and word came to the President that he (Clemenceau) had had inserted a whole paragraph saying that the Americans and English bound themselves to come to the assistance of France if she was attacked.

"This treaty had been prepared and drafted by the representatives of all the powers, 27 in all, and no one had a right to change a word without the consent of the whole session."

The paragraph was stricken out, but it was again put in. After much difficulty the President kept out this determination to keep us in future wars. That is the inglorious ending of a treaty that, instead of leaving us national respect for our participation in the

war, presents us in a role of simple-minded novices used by past masters in the game to divide up the spoils we helped them secure.

Will we get into another European war after such an "inglorious" result? Ex-Secretary of War Baker, who should know better than any living President or any Member of the American Congress, says it will be "almost impossible" for us to keep out. He said that on December 1, 1933; and Simonds, equally noted as a war correspondent and responsible writer, says our participation is "inevitable."

SIMONDS SEES WAR SOON, AND WE ARE IN

Frank H. Simonds is a war authority ranking with many minds higher than our statesmen or the military experts of Europe. Some of the latter speak for local consumption and a spirit of bluff and bluster that frequently ends in war and is found in nearly every land. Not so with Simonds.

In fixing responsibility for threatening war conditions, and owing to long European association, Simonds naturally does not agree with Washington on foreign entanglements. His conclusions, however, are always received with concern by those who know his familiarity with conditions.

Heretofore I have quoted war threats from reliable authorities, but in Simonds' recent book, *Can Europe Keep the Peace?* he adds a postscript dated July 12, 1932, from which I quote one brief comment on European conditions. It does not express any hope for peace but sums up facts in 350 pages of European war discussion and is an important contribution to be read with war comments first quoted. Simonds says in conclusion, page 367:

The European chaos not only endures but visibly continues to spread, it becomes increasingly difficult to escape the conviction that the World War, so far from having been an isolated, if tremendous, episode, was in fact only the opening phase of another universal convulsion like the Thirty Years' War or the French Revolution, which lasted from 1792 to 1815.

In any event the history of the past 8 months seems to confirm the thesis of this book, that the war in Europe, which began in 1914, still continues, and that as long as peoples set their national policies above their material interests and, in the face of miseries which are beyond exaggeration, continue to follow their present course, it is futile to seek to preserve a peace which does not exist by signing pacts to abolish war or holding conferences to promote disarmament.

SIMONDS AND BAKER BELIEVE OUR ENTRANCE IN THE NEXT EUROPEAN WAR IS INEVITABLE AND IMPOSSIBLE NOT TO BE INVOLVED

Frank Simonds, the same war writer, has just issued, December 6, 1933, another book, *"America Faces the Next War"*, and says our participation is "inevitable."

Europe is on the threshold of another general war and the American people have the right and duty to ask of their Government what the policy of the United States is to be.

That is his question on our inevitable participation in the next European war.

His judgment is that of an eminent writer and war observer. What will be our own policy during the long European war period? Will we inevitably be in or be able to resist inspired war propaganda and war hysteria that has surrounded us in the past? Passage by Congress of House Joint Resolution 103, providing for a plebiscite, will block efforts to drag us into Europe's powder magazine. That measure gives the people a right to determine by their vote whether war shall come before Congress acts. Is Congress afraid to trust the people to vote for or against war?

IN FOREIGN WARS, SENTIMENT FOR ONE'S ANCESTORS OCCURS

In the United States, a melting pot of all peoples, it is certain that injection into any European war will inevitably stir up bitter antagonisms within our own country. The United States should avoid foreign entanglements, particularly because of our own cosmopolitan people drawn from every corner of Europe.

The Hitler-Semitic issue brings efforts from both sides among Americans to have this Government involved in the issue. Russian communism that ousted the nobility and intelligentsia has been a constant issue until recent Soviet recognition. Austria's threats against Hitlerism and Hungary's demand to get its land back have found insistent supporters and opponents in our own land, while attempts by Japan to swallow China would have us sending warships to the Mikado even as our Naval Secretary recently sailed for

Cuba to settle matters, although fortunately the pilot landed him in Honolulu. A Fascist program in Italy, like Greece-Turkey responsibility for Smyrna, has its local defenders, but efforts of European debtors and war writers of Europe to have a cancelation of their debts if German reparations are to be wiped out disclose a concerted debt situation that has occurred in Europe after these United States started late in the day to underwrite the Allies' World War activities. We lost friends everywhere by that war. All Europe will again want us to meddle in their disputes when war comes, which insures kicks from all nations and factions—our certain reward.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SOME PRESIDENT TO ACT JUSTLY

If President Roosevelt, following Simonds' and Secretary Baker's foreign war prophecy, will say to the country the people should decide before this Government declares war, a policy of peace for the United States will be certain. All that remains is for the President to make that decision and Congress will act. If President Roosevelt is reelected because he kept us out of war, history may write so was President Wilson reelected. Protection to the people and to the President and to Congress against ruthless propaganda will be had by a plebiscite.

My resolution giving the people that constitutional right is before Congress now, and with both branches of Congress certain to follow the President's recommendation, it will bring unlimited glory to President Roosevelt or any other Executive and prove he is whole-heartedly for the people's right to rule on war and peace by granting this just right.

Our policy in the Spanish-American canned-beef, tropical-disease, Cuban war was remember the *Maine* and humanity. Our policy in the World War was a war to end wars, self-determination of peoples, and making the world a safe place to live in, with other catch phrases financed by Liberty bonds. No wonder Bernard Shaw and Europe generally size us up on past professions and reasoning.

I have given evidence of all powerful influences that bring on our wars. The greatest democracy in the world should set an example for peace by giving its people the right to declare peace, and not profiteers and nonfighting pharisees to declare war. Those who fight and pay should have that right.

With war experts declaring an early European war threatens and our entrance is inevitable, we evidence Nero's fiddling of centuries ago to prove unconcern of war by an intelligent people that has not changed in all the centuries as war fast approaches. Propaganda in times of peace covers the press, and we argue fiercely over comparable trifles. Inevitable war comes when organized propaganda agencies again surround and capture Congress as in the past. The only proposed prevention is through a plebiscite given the people in advance. Will the people be given that right in time?

Mr. Chairman, I started these remarks with the purpose of expressing acknowledgments to the Presidential power that was able in one brief year to secure from Congress a plebiscite on the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. If on a matter I submit of minor importance, compared with a plebiscite on war, the President could prevail on the American Congress and American people to repeal a constitutional amendment relating to liquor, I further submit his tremendous influence for good if cast for my war resolution quoted or any like constitutional measure to insure protection to the American people against needless war. I offer this proposal with that hope in behalf of the people whom he serves in the highest place.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN].

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that all of the debate has been about what is popularly known as "hard liquor." Nothing about wines. Coming from the greatest wine-producing State in the world, I realize that with proper encouragement and protection this industry can be the source of a large income to the Federal Government. Just before prohibition went into effect, California wines

had a reputation in the markets of the world, second to none. Wherever they were exhibited the wines took gold medals and blue ribbons, and many of the prizes offered. Even their champagnes, after many years of experimentation, were turned out in such fine quality that at the exposition in Turin, Italy, they were awarded the gold medal.

From an agricultural point of view there is no industry in America that employs as many men, proportionally, and employs them for as long a season as does the wine industry and the grape-growing industry in the State of California. Before prohibition this industry was tremendously encouraged by the United States Government. All through the wine-growing section of California you would find agricultural experiment stations conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture. Here all sorts of analyses of the soil were made. Here the grape grower was helped in every way. In California we make a variety of wines that is second to none and of a quality that cannot be excelled. When the vineyards of France were threatened with destruction they sent to California for cuttings of their vines to reestablish their vineyards.

Before prohibition we were exporting from California enormous quantities of wine to France, and those wines were used as a base for French wines, for which we afterwards paid exorbitant prices in this country. Every type of wine made in California is equal to the very finest imported wine of the same brand. I feel that not only will a fair tax on wine increase the Federal revenue but will relieve unemployment and materially increase the national wealth. I would like to see a high tariff placed for the time being on all imported wines in order to encourage the vineyards not only of my own State but the States of Ohio and New York and other States where wine making is a real industry. Along with the revival of wine making will come a revival of many other industries. The business of cooperage has almost fallen into disuse in the last 15 years. That will be revived. As I said, it will give employment to not only a great number of men in the agricultural line but for a greater number of hours than any other agricultural product in this country. [Applause.]

I yield back that balance of my time.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I realize the futility at times of attempting to make people agree with you on something about which you have a strong conviction. I have, for a long time, had a conviction of what should be the tax on liquor. I have no distilleries in my district. There are no vineyards there. I have no interest directly or indirectly in any distillery or any wholesaler or any retailer of rum or in any bootlegger. While I put them all in the same class, I would put every bootlegger in jail. They are all about equally respectable, as far as I am concerned.

My concern is with the consumer secondly and with the Government which I represent, first. I know how we secured the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Some of us here in this House "turned somersaults" for the last 11 years endeavoring to get that amendment out of the Constitution. We withstood the ridicule and the sometimes unfair attacks and imputations from the "drys", but we kept plugging, when along came the Hoover depression, and the Government was in dire need of revenue. Our Budget was not balanced. Millions of our people were out of work. Then we who took some part in the movement for repeal, proceeded to sell the idea to the American people that the way to balance the Budget was to repeal the eighteenth amendment and get the necessary revenue from liquor. We went to the country with that persuasive argument, and I am firmly convinced that if we had not had the opportunity of using that argument, that repeal meant needed revenue for our Government, we would not have had repeal for at least 10 years. We did sell that idea to the American people. Our party platforms emphasized it. We promised the people that if they would repeal the eighteenth amendment, we would procure from the liquor traffic enough reve-

nue to balance our Budget. I, for one, if I am the only one left to take such a position in this administration, am going to keep that agreement we made with the American people. Now that we have got repeal accomplished I am not going to run out on the promises we made to our citizens. I could not face them now if I were false to those promises.

There was without question an understanding—true, an informal understanding—in this House and in that other body that in the event of repeal the tax on whisky would be about \$6 per gallon. We discussed it. Every committee and subcommittee of the "wet" groups that had anything to do with the repeal resolution had that idea definitely in mind. Now, are we so-called "wets" going to back out on the representations we made to the American people? Have we stood here for 11 years making this fight for the sole benefit of a few hungry distillers, without any concern for the consumer, and with only a pittance to be paid into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I appreciate what the gentleman has said about the long fight to bring about the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

I also, as other Members of the House, realize what the gentleman's party promised to do at its convention in Chicago—balance the Budget. I may suggest to the gentleman that at the rate his party is spending money even a tax of \$1,000 per gallon on every gallon of whisky produced in this country this year will not balance the Budget, because it cannot be done; you are spending too much money. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman, who was one of the most prominent advocates of repeal in this House, will go along with me on the tax I propose, he will at least help to balance the Budget, which is his sworn duty, even though he is a member of the Republican minority, whose tactics are obviously going to be obstructive and political rather than cooperative.

Now, what has happened? It must be understood that these legitimate distillers have only one concern, and that is their own pocketbooks. In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, outside of some representatives of that committee or departments of Government, there was nobody there, except myself, who was talking for the Government or for the consumer. Every other witness was talking in behalf of his own interest.

All over this Capitol Building, all over the White House, all over the Treasury Department, I can see, as can anybody who has eyes with which to see, there has been emblazoned a slogan, a slogan sold through the newspapers with their huge liquor ads, a slogan sold to the Congress—yes, sold to the high executives in the Capitol. This is it: "High taxes mean the continuance of the bootlegger." Well, this bromide has been propagated by the distillers and their lobbyists to such an extent that it presents the greatest obstacle some of us have in trying to get fair revenue for our Government out of whisky.

Let me tell you what the slogan should be. It is not, "High taxes mean the continuance of the bootlegger;" it is, "High prices mean the continuance of the bootlegger." The bootlegger will not continue in the business if the profits are only normal. He will only stay in the business so long as the present extortionate prices are maintained. We saw that happen in the case of beer. As you know, I advocated a higher tax on beer. I favored a tax of \$7.50 a barrel. By adopting a \$5 tax the Government has thrown away \$100,000,000 in revenue this year. The brewers as a result of our solicitude for them have been making eight or nine times as much on a barrel of beer as they did before prohibition.

Did the racketeers go out of the brewery business when beer became legalized? Of course not. These extortionate profits obtainable keep them in the same old game. Why the first brewery license issued in Chicago was to none other than to Mr. Al Capone, although he was at the time so-

journing in Atlanta. The boys in Jersey, "Waxey Gordon" for instance, never went out of the brewery business while the extortionate prices were obtainable. The boys in New York, on the West Side, and over in Brooklyn, never went out of the brewery business while the price was kept high. The Government could readily have received a higher tax, but it was thrown away by our overenthusiastic wets; and that is just what this report proposes to do as to rum.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Is it not a fact that even though in Canada the tax is \$7 a gallon, one can buy the best whisky for not over \$1.60 to \$1.80 a quart?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I will answer for the gentleman that such is the case.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know nothing about it. As a matter of fact, my information is to the contrary; and there was testimony before the committee that in England where the tax is \$14 per gallon, and in Canada where the tax is \$7 a gallon, they do not have bootlegging.

Please do not fall for this propaganda, that high taxes mean the continuance of the bootlegger. The distillers have flooded this Capitol with their paid agents to keep constantly repeating it. They have engaged in their publicity bureaus the boys from the press galleries. They have taken them out of the White House. They have put on the biggest campaign of corruption ever known in this country to sell that slogan to the American people that "high taxes means the continuance of the bootlegger." I will admit it has been sold to date. I am battling against armed forces already in command of a citadel.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does not the gentleman recognize that one of the fundamentals of taxation which our people have learned is that the Government should not be dependent for revenue upon what is regarded as an evil thing? The reason we do not have lotteries and many other evil things is because we do not want our Government dependent for revenues upon what we regard with disfavor. Heretofore many States that are now really dry regarded the rum business as one of the evil things. I repeat again what I said this morning: "In my section of the country I am satisfied the feeling was that the way to get rid of the bootlegger was to repeal the eighteenth amendment." The fundamental thought should be that we do not want this Government dependent upon things which are regarded by at least some as evils.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, that is all right. I am not in much disagreement with my friend. I, too, would hate to see my Government dependent on revenue from the rum business. The committee received some expert testimony. They had before them, for instance, Dr. Doran, the greatest Borgia the United States has ever known. Probably no individual in this Nation ever poisoned so many people or caused the death of so many people by that most harmless method of letting them take liquid from a black bottle denatured with poisons which only the bootlegger knew how to partly remove. He was doing his duty, but he was so severe and so arbitrary toward the whisky fellows, and he led them such a merry chase and made them conduct their business so exactly, and recently he was so severe on the distillers in reference to the quotas they should get, that they begged, drafted, and hired him as their czar to rule, regulate, and conduct their business as against the interests of his former employer, the United States of America. When he appeared before the committee he was speaking for his clients, the distillers. I think he is an estimable gentleman. I do not intend to say anything derogatory of him, but if he was ever responsible for the results of poisonous liquor when he held his governmental office before repeal, today his people are putting out hundreds of times as much poisonous whisky as they or the bootleggers ever did before the repeal of prohibition. So the doctor continues in the same old business.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, the gentleman does not want to be misunderstood by the country. I assume the gentleman knows just as much, or maybe more, about the liquor business as I do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Only as a consumer.

Mr. BRITTEN. The distillers, however, are not turning out poisonous liquor. It may be a poor grade of liquor, but no one should say seriously that they are putting out millions and millions of gallons of poisonous liquor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall say it, and, furthermore, I can prove it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Where does the gentleman get his information?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall tell the gentleman. I have asked the Agricultural Department to go around to the drug stores in Washington, the People's Drug Stores, for instance, and seize every bit of the whisky in these drug stores, because every bottle of it is illegally there. These drug stores, under the law, can sell liquor only on prescription. The prescriptions call for spiritus frumenti. The United States Pharmacopœia says that spiritus frumenti is 4-year-old whisky, aged in the wood, yet not a drug store in Washington has on its shelves anything but blended whisky, a concoction which cannot answer to a prescription for spiritus frumenti.

Why does not Dr. Campbell, of the Pure Food and Drugs Bureau, seize this illegal liquor? Is he fearful of Schenley? You cannot buy straight or real whisky in the drug stores of Washington, and they are not entitled to sell this blended whisky. A drug store in Washington will order Schenley whisky in bond, and yet this blended stuff comes along; for instance, Finch's Golden Wedding. It is put up in dark bottles, so you cannot see what is inside. A competent chemist here recently analyzed some of it, and pronounced it unfit, saying that it should never be prescribed for a patient.

Why, as you know, whisky is often prescribed for babies as young as 1 year old in order to save them from pneumonia or other disease. It is given to old people who are sick. But no respectable physician would permit a blend, which is nothing but raw alcohol, to be prescribed for a baby or an aged patient. You say the whisky of today is not poison? It would poison some of our people, and the continual drinking of it, even by such a robust, virile young man as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], would lead to something serious after the course of a few years. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Would the gentleman care to express an opinion as to whether or not this committee should consider an amendment to this bill which would require a label to be placed upon every bottle that contained blended liquor, stating its percentage?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; and I state that the gentleman was kind enough to have discussed that subject with me. I am considering offering such an amendment.

Do you know what we did in New York City? Our health commissioner, Dr. Wynne, sent around to the drug stores in that city and bought up samples of this whisky. It was not bootleg whisky. It was whisky sold by the Whisky Trust; by the national distillers and Schenley, controlling 90 percent of all the whisky in the United States.

Dr. Wynne had it brought in and tested, and then he said:

No bootlegger ever had the audacity to sell the American people such stuff.

In New York City we thereupon passed an ordinance which provides that there must be stated on the label just what is contained in the bottle. If there is 1 ounce of straight whisky, or 2 ounces of 2-year-old whisky, or 3 ounces of 1-year-old whisky and the rest plain alcohol, that fact must be stated on the label. I do hope that before this bill becomes a law a similar provision will be incorporated. I shall tell you how to reach these gluttonous distillers who care

only for their pockets and not for the health of our people. If I continue to have the industry and the enthusiasm within the next few weeks, I shall propose an amendment to the Pure Food and Drugs Act, prohibiting the artificial coloring of whisky. Straight whisky is never colored. It gets its whole color from the charred oak staves.

If you could prohibit the putting of coloring into this whisky, and it is only put in to deceive the public, and prohibit them from using the dark bottles, which they do deliberately, you would know when you were buying this stuff that it was not real whisky, because it would then be white. You would know you were buying "white mule" and you would not buy it. This is the way to break the back of the Whisky Trust.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Doran is opposed to putting a label on the whisky, is he not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He is fighting the label proposition?

Mr. O'CONNOR. He says, in a threatening manner, that these distillers will not send their stuff into New York. Imagine them neglecting us. I hope they will not send it. They will save the lives of many of our citizens. The bootleggers were at least frank. You will have to give them credit for that. They were not such bad fellows, after all. They did not call this poison blended or rectified, as the legitimate distillers do. They had another word for it. They called it "cut." That is all these distillers are doing, "cutting" whisky. They are cutting it with raw alcohol, unfit for any stomach.

Now, let us see as to what tax should be imposed on spirits. We promised the American people that if they would repeal the eighteenth amendment we would raise hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue in taxes. I do not believe you can ever raise it by a \$2 tax. Just before prohibition whisky sold for from 75 cents to \$1 a quart retail.

Let us take the price of a case, in order to get a fair example, and one which is more readily understood. Let us take a case of whisky, Overholt, for instance, made by the Mellons, a good powerful whisky. That would be delivered by the case to your house for \$8.25. On that case of 12 quart bottles there was a tax of \$1.10 per gallon, or \$3.30 a case. That figures exactly a tax of 40 percent of the sales price on a case of whisky.

What do you propose to do by a \$2 a gallon tax? You are not increasing the taxes. You are reducing them. You are putting a tax of \$6 on a case of whisky today which these same fellows sell for at least \$34. I am not going to multiply that to 340 when it is cut 10 times. You are paying really \$340 for it. Mr. Seton Porter, head of the National Distillers, announced to the public that they would cut it 10 times. He also said that whisky that sold at 90 cents before prohibition would cost about \$10. If whisky that sold before prohibition for 90 cents is cut 10 times, what you are getting today is only equivalent to what was worth 9 cents before prohibition, except for the infinitesimal cost of the alcohol put in it to cut it.

You cannot even buy straight whisky, and when you are paying \$10 for what was worth 9 cents before prohibition you can figure out the percentage of increase for yourself. So where the tax was \$1.10 a gallon before prohibition, it is now only a few cents a gallon under your \$2 rate.

Taxes, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL] has said, have no relation to the price of liquor. Long before repeal the Whisky Trust sat down in the Kuhn-Loeb Building, at 52 William Street in New York City, and agreed that they would maintain a price of about \$40 a case, and Mr. Wisekopf and Mr. Jacobi and the other boys, who used to sell the whisky to the bootleggers during prohibition and who are now in the legitimate distilling business, proceeded to consider "what the traffic would bear." The tax was of no consideration. If there were no tax at all, you would still be paying the same price for whisky today. That is the point of my argument. Or, if the tax were \$10 a gallon, you would not be paying any more, be-

cause there is a peak as to what the traffic will bear or what the public will pay, and the gougers cannot go beyond this even in spite of their gluttony.

Now, let us see why the tax does not enter into the price you have to pay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. While the gentleman says the tax is not reflected in the present high prices, when competitive conditions occur and we get back to competition, would not the gentleman say that the tax would be reflected in the price of the product then?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. If the tax were too high, it would.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In other words, a \$10 tax might be prohibitive so far as money coming into the Treasury is concerned.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, yes, I will admit that; but here is what the gentleman loses sight of: I think it was Dr. Doran who appeared before the gentleman's committee, or one of the Treasury Department experts, and said, "The first year keep the tax low; the second year increase it, and all the way up." Why, that is ridiculous. It should be just the reverse of that.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I may say to the gentleman that I do not agree with that philosophy.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The true philosophy in economics is just the reverse. The Government should be getting the tax while the getting is good; and this first year of flurry and excitement over repeal is the time in which to get it. Make the tax \$5 the first year and when real competition does set in reduce it, if necessary. That is my theory, and the gentleman and myself are not in disagreement about it.

Now, let us see how the taxes do not enter at all into the price you pay. Just take today and this minute, for instance. National Distillers and Schenley will get, we will say, from the wholesalers, \$34 a case for the rotten whisky they are putting out. We will not bother about it being cut 24 times, but we will assume it is real whisky at \$34 a case and on which they pay taxes of \$3.30 a case. Hiram Walker & Co., Ltd., the Canadian distillery, which has just started a distillery in Peoria, Ill., have their whisky in Canada and they have to pay tariff of \$5 per gallon, the present tax of \$1.10 a gallon, and other duties. The total taxes that they pay on a case of whisky by the time it is landed in New York is \$22 a case, as compared with \$3.30 that National Distillers or Schenley pay, and yet they sell their whisky for the very same price of \$34 and make \$5 a case profit. Can you tell me how the taxes enter into it? You can find out these facts for yourselves. The importer pays \$22 taxes per case, as against the \$3.30 a case that these fellows pay that have monopolized the domestic supply, and the importer still sells it for the same price and makes \$5 a case. Do the taxes enter into that picture?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Suppose we took the duty off of Canadian liquor; would that bring down the prices?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It should be taken off until the domestic supply is adequate and the monopoly is destroyed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Until we drive the racketeers out of the business.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Until we break the back of the Whisky Trust.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If you are going to legislate here in favor of the Whisky Trust, it is time the American people should know about it.

I repeat that you are not increasing taxes. The present tax of \$1.10 a gallon on whisky was 27½ cents a quart, and when you make it \$2 a gallon you put it up to 50 cents a quart. In the past, however, when you paid 27½ cents, you got a quart of straight whisky; but what you get today is only worth one tenth of what you got before. So the net result is you are reducing the taxes. The distillers paid 40

percent in taxes on a case of whisky before prohibition. If you put a tax of \$5 a gallon on whisky at the prices today, it will be about the same rate of 40 percent.

Dr. Doran suggested to me, while he was holding public office, that the distillers were a lot of extortioners, and suggested that we put an excess-profits tax on them.

I appreciate the difficulty about that. I realize the illegality of singling out any one class or any one business and putting an excess-profits tax on them alone; but if you will tax at the average prices charged today and figure the same tax of 40 percent, you will arrive at about my proposal of a tax of \$5 a gallon.

Let us now see whether the taxes on the different alcoholic beverages are proportionate. The Rockefeller Foundation advocated that taxes be fixed in accordance with the alcoholic content of liquor.

I am inclined to agree with that, but let us see what the committee proposes to do. Let us compare the tax of \$5 a barrel on beer and this proposed tax of \$2 a gallon on whisky. In a barrel of beer there are about 250 salable glasses. With a \$5 per barrel tax that amounts to a tax of 2 cents on each glass of beer. So when a man pays 10 cents, the average price, for a glass of beer, he pays a 2-cent tax on that beer. At \$2 a gallon on whisky, the tax is only 2½ cents on each glass. Is that proportionate? Is that fair? In other words, a man is going to pay 25, 40, or 50 cents for whisky—three to five times as much as for beer—and the Government will only get an additional tax of one half cent.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman says there are 250 glasses of beer in a barrel. Will the gentleman state what size glasses he means?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Twelve ounces.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I believe that the tax on beer is too high.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what the brewers will contend. You are taxing beer at 2 cents a drink and whisky at only 2½ cents a drink. That is not fair. The tax on whisky should be at least three times the tax on beer.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is favoring a tax of \$5 a gallon on whisky.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. That is equal to 40 percent of the old selling price, as the producer is manufacturing whisky for \$12.50 a gallon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the gentleman is taking some figures he heard here on the floor. For making a gallon of whisky the cost of 50 cents is more nearly correct.

Mr. MAY. I was predicating my question upon the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], made a while ago, that a \$5 tax would represent 40 percent of the selling price, which would mean a selling price of \$12.50 per gallon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am talking about the selling price to the consumer. That is \$3 a quart.

Mr. MAY. If it costs but 30 cents—or even 50 cents—to produce a gallon of whisky, would not the bootlegger who produces impure whisky be able, without any tax at all, to undersell the man who sells pure whisky that the gentleman favors, so that the public, the common man, will use the bad whisky instead of the good?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the gentleman forces me again to seem to come to the defense of the bootlegger, whom I hate. So far as this question of impure whisky is concerned, right today, the national distillers, Schenley, and those fellows along the Illinois River are buying whisky from the bootlegger and cutting it 10 to 20 times. If you want to get further information about that, read my statement before the Ways and Means Committee in which I mentioned the quantities they were buying. For instance, about 1922 Mellon sold a few hundred thousand gallons of Overholt to the bootleggers at about \$3 per gallon. Of course, the

Mellons knew that whisky was going into bootleg channels. They knew it was not going to be dispensed in Bellevue Hospital. Today the bootleggers have some of that whisky left—77,000 gallons, I understand—and national distillers are negotiating to buy it back from them at about \$14 per gallon, a fair price when they will cut it at least 15 times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield me some more time?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. In order to say in reply to the question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that the gentleman who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means representing the Kentucky distillers made the statement that he would enter into a contract with anybody who wanted such contract to deliver old standard brands of Kentucky whisky for \$5 a case.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Surely. That is about what they were getting for it before prohibition, and paying a \$1.10 a gallon tax or \$3.30 a case.

Mr. MAY. But that was on condition that they put a smaller tax on it than you are proposing in this bill.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. No; there was no such condition as that.

Mr. MAY. Here it is in your minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This great bugaboo that high taxes mean a continuation of the bootlegger is so ridiculous, when you analyze it, that it should not frighten a child, let alone Members of Congress. During prohibition the bootleggers have been conducting distilleries, and I am informed that they were very modern and efficient plants. The testimony before the committee was that these bootleg distilleries turned out better liquor than the old distillers ever made. They had more sanitary distilleries than the old rum crowd ever had, I understand. Do you mean to say that in this country of ours, after repeal, a bootlegger can run a distillery? Perhaps he can have a still in his cellar or in the mountains, but you must remember that during prohibition the American people were the friends of the bootlegger. They would not inform upon him. They were sympathetic with him.

Now, however, that the eighteenth amendment has been repealed, there are probably a million people going into the legitimate liquor business directly or indirectly, so you have added a million enforcement agents in the United States. You have a million informers, who will not permit a bootleg distillery to operate. Oh, you will always have moonshining. You would have moonshining if the tax were only 50 cents a gallon. You will always have some smuggling, as you always have had, but you will never have any organized bootlegging industry if you use your efforts to cut down the present extortionate prices. I realize that in this particular bill, or in any similar bill, you cannot do much about the prices of liquor, but what I am contending for is that the Government of the United States should get a fair proportion of those extortionate profits. There is no reason why those profits should all go into the hands of a few bootlegging distillers. Mark you further, that much of those extortionate profits will go out of the country. People in Canada control some of our largest distilleries in this country. Bankers and people in England and in Scotland have very substantial interests in distilleries in this country. Much of those extortionate profits will go out of this country, untaxed. Here we are reducing the taxes instead of increasing them, with many benefits going to foreigners. I hope, therefore, everyone here will support the amendment which I shall offer tomorrow for an increase in the tax on whisky.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. With reference to the proposed amendment affecting labels, I call the attention of the

gentleman, as well as of the Members of the House, to regulation 20 under the Pure Food and Drugs Act, which reads as follows:

(b) Compounds and blends, in order to be within section 8, paragraph 4, in the case of food, subparagraph 2, shall bear on the label the word "compound" or "blend", as the case may be, and in addition a clear statement of the principal or essential ingredients of the article.

And subsequent thereto, when it refers to the method of stating quantity or proportions:

(a) The quantity of alcohol in a drug shall be stated in terms of the average percentage by volume of absolute alcohol in the finished product.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not heard anybody state that those existing laws would cover the labeling of whisky. It seems to refer to drugs. As for blending, the gentlemen from Kentucky know that blending means taking whisky, and nothing but whisky, of different ages and putting it together, old whisky and new whisky. That is not what you are buying in your drug stores today, however. You are getting "cut" whisky, a small percentage of whisky and the rest raw alcohol.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MAY. How many million gallons or hundred million gallons of rectified whisky do you suppose will be sold on credit of the million gallons of pure whisky we have in store?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, I would say that those million gallons of straight whisky will make at least 15,000,000 gallons of stuff that the American people will be compelled to buy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Has the gentleman indicated to the House what his amendment is to be?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman mean the amount of the tax?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Five dollars a gallon.

I do hope the House will consider the question over night. The amendment will be offered tomorrow. I hope you will reconsider any ideas you have had to this minute and think through this slogan that has been sold to you, that "high taxes mean a continuation of the bootlegger." I believe the answer to that deliberate propaganda is that high prices mean a continuation of the bootlegger, and as long as these high prices continue our Government, the American Government, should share by means of higher taxes. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish, in a few minutes, to corroborate some of the things that our good colleague, Mrs. KAHN, stated about California wines and to which I will add the Ohio and New York wines. There is going to be and there is today a lot of bootlegging in wines. Not all of the bootlegging is confined to hard liquor. California and Ohio and New York champagnes are being sold with fake French labels on them. The trick comes in listing the vintage. French wines ordinarily are very cheap, but just as soon as you put the vintage date on the bottle, the vintage of a good year, that wine is very valuable. It commands high prices; 1912 to 1919 French champagnes are almost out of the market. If you get a bottle of New York or California wine with a French label on it marked "1912" or "1919", you will pay from \$7 to \$15 a bottle for it. If you buy it in a speak-easy, you will pay \$20 for it, and you will get the same California or New York wines that you might buy under ordinary circumstances for \$2.50 or \$2. There is so little difference between good American champagne and wine and French champagne and wine that it takes a connoisseur to tell the difference. The bootlegger gets a vast difference in price. Bootleggers and speak-easies are selling falsely labeled champagne at very high prices.

I am sorry that it is not possible, under the rules of the House, to offer an amendment to this bill that we will vote

upon tomorrow, that would provide for a complete embargo on French wines and brandies. It ought to be done. It ought to be done in the interest of good business. It ought to be done as a protective measure for the vineyards of America, and I say that for two reasons.

My first reason is, of course, protection to the American producer. My second reason is—and it is almost as important as the first—that France is a defaulter nation. She deliberately refuses to pay her honorable debts, although she has in gold—actual gold bullion in reserve—much more per capita than the United States has. My friend from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF, reminds me that she has a lot of gold in this country earmarked.

There was a time when we had a Department of State—ordinarily referred to in Europe as our diplomatic corps—that was not spineless and had the courage to guide us in our diplomatic relations in such a manner as to reflect credit upon the sterling Americanism of the Chief Executive. An Americanism that commanded respect in every capital on earth. An Americanism that meant what it said and which did not deal in mere polite phrases. An Americanism which was not piloted by embassy dinners and champagne parties in Washington and cheap decorations which have been heaped upon thousands of important Americans by France. I refer to the days of President Andrew Jackson, when France owed us a number of millions of dollars in honorable debts but persistently refused to pay. President Jackson politely but sternly notified France that unless she showed some disposition to be honorable and pay her just debts America would seize such French commerce or French ships as might be available on the high seas and would credit her account with the value of such prizes. It did not require much time for the French Government to realize that the American Government meant what it said, and they forthwith arranged to pay their debt in full.

Of course, I realize that State Department officials, from the highest to the lowest—and I am not referring to the present Secretary of State, because I regard him very, very highly, and he has only been in office a short time—would jeopardize their social positions in Washington if they were to advise harsh terms for European defaulting nations. It would mean fewer invitations to the embassies. It would mean fewer dancing parties where champagne flows like water. It would mean that their wives would not be listed among the special friends of the embassy hostesses, and this would be the saddest cut of all.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did it ever occur to the gentleman to cite the example of Andrew Jackson to his late President, Mr. Hoover, and his Secretary of State?

Mr. BRITTEN. I did just cite President Andrew Jackson, and you may apply my language to the Hoover or to the Coolidge or the Harding or the Wilson or the present Roosevelt administrations. Of course, Roosevelt has just come into office. If we have ever had a President during my membership in this House—which has been 21 years—who is fearless and who is distinctly courageous, it is Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.] Very few men in any political walk of life have taken the chances he has taken in the last year, or that he intends to take in the present year. I hope to God they will all be successful. The hope of the world is that they will be successful. Up to the present moment they have not been successful, but I realize most of them are theoretical and must be given a reasonable time in which to show their success or failure. Countless millions of dollars are being expended under the advice of "brain trusters" whose political leanings are as red as the wildest Communist; but even some of this money may prove to have been well spent. Only today the President told us in his annual Budget message that this year would see our bonded debt between five and six billion dollars more than it has ever been in the history of our Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. The gentleman is getting me off my subject. I am happy to say that I have every admiration for Franklin D. Roosevelt. I knew him when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson, and I think I understand his character and personality as well as anyone does, and I could not help but feel on yesterday when he addressed the House in person that he was the kind of a President who would ultimately in no uncertain language tell the defaulting European nations who have agreed among themselves to pay us nothing that unless they changed their dishonorable attitude he would bring about American reprisals which might cost them much more annually than their already greatly reduced obligations to us.

Mr. Chairman, when the world depression made it impossible for Brazil to meet her debts to the French Government, France did not waste much time in diplomatic soft-soap, but on the contrary she immediately placed an embargo on Brazilian coffee—and France is a great consumer of coffee—and her future purchases of coffee went elsewhere as a reprisal to Brazil. Why cannot we treat France as she treats others? We are a great wine-drinking Nation and if we must go abroad for this commodity, let us at least do business with honorable nations and those who regard us for what we are and not as puppets. Up to the present moment we have not had the courage to speak frankly to France and this I regard as an American disgrace.

Our State Department has once more shown itself to be a spineless institution when it humbly consented to trade some American apples and pears for a million and a half gallons of French wines and brandies for importation into the United States at a time when the French Government is deliberately defaulting in its payment of its debt of honor to us.

To allow millions of dollars worth of French wines to supplant domestic wines on the tables of American consumers at a time when France is hoarding billions of gold with which to ultimately harass or destroy the monetary policy of President Roosevelt is indicative of a catering diplomacy which completely misunderstands popular sentiment to the contrary.

Defaulter France will later find excuse for not taking our apples and pears, just as they have found subterfuge for breaking other agreements with us.

This is the same France which after the war purchased from us \$2,000,000,000 worth of foodstuffs, automobiles, blankets, and all sorts of wearing apparel for \$407,000,000 and later forgot to pay us for it. They collected much more than the amount due us through the sale of one half of our goods to their citizens and institutions.

This is the same French Government referred to by Gen. George Washington on July 13, 1797, for—

Their insidious hostility to our Government and their disregard of solemn treaties and the laws of the nations; their lawless ambition and intoxicated power, in contempt of every principle of justice, and in violation of solemn compacts and of laws which govern all civilized nations.

Since the days when France gave our ministers their walking papers in 1796 they have always regarded American diplomacy as superficial and without courage.

Our State Department could now well appropriate the words of President Adams when he said:

Such attempts ought to be repelled with a decision which shall convince France, and the world, that we are not a degraded people humiliated under a colonial spirit of fear and sense of inferiority, fitted to be the miserable instruments of foreign influence, and regardless of national honor, character, and interests.

The same thing holds good today, and President Roosevelt could well take the language of General Washington, President Adams, or President Jackson, and tell France where she gets off. It was not done by Hoover, and it was not done by Coolidge. It ought to be done by Roosevelt, and I hope it will be when he comes to us in the near future, as yesterday he said he would, and tells us about the international debts.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will yield to my good friend ANDREW JACKSON MAY.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think, in view of France's conduct toward the payment of her honest debts, it is possible they might dig up an old printing press somewhere and print the figures "1912" on new wines and export them to America?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course they will do it. They are doing it now. I had a bottle of their old vintage just the other day.

Mr. MAY. The label will not honestly show the age of the vintage in the bottle.

Mr. BRITTEN. I had a bottle of so-called "old vintage" from France the other day and I would not give a nickel for it. It was young and of cheap quality.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What does it cost to make a bottle of American champagne?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have not the slightest idea, but there is a champagne expert in the House. Where is the gentleman from California [Mrs. KAHN]?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It costs about 25 cents, and it sells for \$4 a bottle; yet this is not called racketeering!

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. Does not the gentleman think that if we had a substantial Navy, built up to our treaty rights, France might have a different aspect regarding the payment of debts?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, a show of force goes much further in Europe and in Asia than it does over here. I agree with the gentleman. But we have nothing to fear from the French Navy. It is French champagne I am worried about. [Laughter.]

When we allocated the first 784,000 gallons of wine to France they came back for millions more. Someone said—I am quite sure it came from our distinguished President—"Well, what are you going to buy from us?" Oh, well, they scratched their heads for a moment and then thought they might buy some of our fruit. That was a great trade! We said, "All right; will you take some of our pears and some of our apples?"

"Yes; we will take some pears."

So they immediately agreed to take pears, and almost before the agreement was concluded they raised their tariff on pears so no one over there could buy them.

Then we cut that allotment off again, and with a little diplomatic trading they finally agreed to take some of our apples and some more of our pears for 784,000 gallons of their wines and liquors.

Now I am going to make a prediction—this will be printed in France tomorrow, and so probably my guess will be wrong—I make the prediction that if there is a way to be found in France to avoid the purchase of these apples and pears when finally they have been grown in this country and sent over there, France will refuse to take them on one subterfuge or another, just as she has done with her other international obligations. Her word is simply no good.

We are not alone, as a nation. She does that with everybody. I hope that this committee one of these days—and the committee has the authority to do so—will bring in an embargo bill against French wines and French brandies so that not a drop can come into this country. When this has been done, and France is given to understand that we are disgusted with her deceit and her shallow diplomacy, then, and only then, do I predict that she will meet her annual installments to us as any other honorable nation would who had hoarded a gold supply such as France now has. President Roosevelt should pull the mask of deceit from those European nations who have secretly conspired to follow France in her refusal to pay us. France, who can

pay, has surrounded herself by her debtor nations in solid opposition to anything which the United States might desire, and I am quite satisfied that no one knows this better than the President himself. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman and Members, I believe our first consideration should be the proper regulation of the liquor traffic and the second consideration should be that of raising revenue. I do not believe that we can compete with the bootlegger if we raise the tax on liquor as high as is now contemplated. We contemplate a tax of \$2 a gallon. It is an assured thing that the various States will also place a high consumption tax on distilled liquors. Many of the States have already provided a tax of \$1 per gallon.

If we are going to throw upon the States the financial burden of enforcing the liquor laws and enforcing regulations, if we are going to put upon the shoulders of the States the responsibility of doing away with the evils of prohibition and bringing about a proper regulation of the liquor traffic, they are entitled to place a tax upon alcoholic beverages to defray the expense thus incurred. Assuming that the States impose a tax of from 50 cents to \$1 per gallon, the tax to the ultimate consumer will be \$2.50 to \$3 a gallon on the liquor.

Let me say something to you about the so-called "blended liquor." If blended liquor is to be sold at around \$1.50 a quart, I want to say to you that it cannot compete with the moonshine that is now being sold in some sections of this country, because, in the first place, it is not half as good, and, in the second place, it costs much more money. We must remember that during the last 13 years many people in this country have been making their living by manufacturing moonshine liquor. Although it is not exactly pure, and it has some fusel oil in it, still there are some sections of the country that have moonshine liquor 1 and 2 years old in considerable quantity. It is my prediction that in the near future they will be taking some of that moonshine liquor and mixing it with the so-called "blended liquor" in order to give a better flavor to the blended liquor. I think it would be an improvement over the so-called "blended whisky" now being sold. Do you know what "cut whisky" is? That is what they used to call "squirrel whisky." About two drinks of it and you would want to climb a tree.

Blended whisky is not the grade of whisky the American people have been asking for, but that is about all that will be available for the present at least. I presume that most of the good whisky will be used for blending purposes and that the American people will be obliged to pay a tax of about \$3 per gallon on blended whisky.

I believe we should be liberal enough so that we will have a price on the so-called "blended whisky" low enough so that the people will not be tempted to buy illegally distilled liquor.

Insofar as beer is concerned, I want to say that a tax of \$5 per barrel is far too high.

I have no brief for the brewers. I believe they have been overcharging the people since they have had the opportunity of selling legal beer. We were told by the brewers last spring that if we put a tax of \$5 a barrel on beer that we would be able to get a good 5-cent glass of beer. It is true you can go to some places today and get a glass of beer for a nickel, but it is one of those small glasses; and if you want a reasonably large glass of beer, you have to pay a dime for it at almost any place.

I believe the American people should be permitted to obtain a reasonably good-sized glass of beer for 5 cents.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Has the gentleman looked into the question far enough to determine whether the excessive price of beer is the fault of the brewer or the retailer?

Mr. BOILEAU. I believe it is largely due to the high tax that the Government has placed upon it and also due to the fact that the brewers are getting too much for their beer.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. When we levied a tax of \$5 a barrel on beer, we were told by the brewers that they could produce and sell good beer for 5 cents a glass. This is not being done, and I have wondered whether the trouble is with the wholesaler or the retailer.

Mr. BOILEAU. I believe the price that the manufacturer is getting for his beer is excessive, and I also believe there are too many places selling beer, so that they have not the volume of sales. There should be some regulation of the matter. However, I do want to state that the tax we are placing upon beer is one of the factors contributing to its high price.

In the old days when we were placing a Federal tax of \$1 on beer, the breweries were delivering it to the retailer at \$6 a barrel and getting \$5 net for their barrel of beer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. At that time the breweries were charging \$6, paying \$1 tax to the Government, and getting \$5 net for the beer.

In addition to this, whenever they delivered a barrel of beer to the saloon keepers, as they were called in those days, the deliveryman was instructed to spend a dollar treating the customers. This made a net of \$4 a barrel which they were getting for their beer. In addition to this, one man would go around at the end of the month and collect for the month's sales of beer and would spend all the way from 10 to 15 percent of what he collected in treating, so that the brewery actually received about \$3.50 a barrel. I believe I can substantiate these figures in showing that they received \$3.50 net after paying the tax, and so forth.

Since we put the beer bill into effect, the breweries have been getting all the way from \$12 to \$16 a barrel, so that with the \$5 tax and a State tax of \$1, the breweries have been getting all the way from six to ten dollars a barrel net for their beer, which is two or three times as much as they received before prohibition. It costs very little more to manufacture and distribute beer today. I believe they could cut down their price a good deal in order to assist in making beer available to the public at 5 cents a glass, and I believe the Government should contribute by reducing the tax on beer in order to bring down the price, and that the tavern keeper, or whatever you may want to call the person who sells beer at retail, would be in a position to sell a good 5-cent glass of beer and make a fair profit for himself.

I believe the Federal Government should reduce the tax from \$5 to \$3 a barrel and should then expect the breweries to do their part in reducing the cost of beer to the public. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER].

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman, practically all the discussion here this afternoon has been from the standpoint of a tax or an income. There has not been a thing said about the moral side of this question. I am going to touch on that for a few minutes, if I may.

We have now, for about 13 or 14 years, trained every no-good rascal and his brother in this country on how to make whisky, and whisky has been made practically everywhere in the United States. I can personally vouchsafe the statement that in 7 months' time in the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., behind those four walls, there were 117 stills raided by the guards of the penitentiary.

Everyone knows that liquor can be made very reasonably. The bootleggers, the moonshiners, and the still owners, still have their stills and know how to make it, and they are going to keep on making it as long as this unemployment problem is in existence, and they are not going to pay any tax, and they are going to be able to sell it far below what the legitimate dealer is going to be able to sell it for, even with a \$2 tax. I should be more in favor of cutting the tax down to \$1 a gallon and selling legitimate liquor and selling

more of it. I believe the Government will get far more revenue by doing this.

I should also like to see an embargo placed upon French liquors. The other day I happened to be a passenger on a boat and one of the passengers was an importer of liquor, who has been in this business for many years. This question about the apples that France was going to take came up. We had done a fine trick to France. We had made them take our apples, and we were going to take French liquors. This man had just come from France, and he informed me that several years ago the French had got a formula by which they were taking apples and making applejack into cognac brandy. So the French are going to send our own apples back here in bottles, and we are going to pay big prices for them. So once more our own grape growers and our people here who are producing the things necessary in the making of liquors will be going without and the French will be bootlegging applejack cider for cognac brandy. Another thing about this liquor problem is this. When I was a boy—and this applies to most of the Members of the Congress here—when we were all young and went to a dance, if a girl smelled liquor on our breath she would not dance with us.

If there happened to be a young lady who smelled of liquor, the boys were afraid to dance with her for fear they would be talked about. Since this prohibition went into effect I am informed that if you wanted to take a girl out the first thing she asked was, "Have you got a bottle?" That is what prohibition has done for us, and that is what we are going to get—we are going to keep on consuming bootleg liquor if you make the price too high. But if you put it down cheap, as it was when Abraham Lincoln sold it for 25 cents per quart, the situation will be different, because it costs a lot of money as it is now. Some young lady thinks she is having a good time because some young man is spending a lot of money. Some young man takes a girl out and she is disappointed because he does not spend a lot of money, and she says, "What do you think you are doing, trying to buy me for 25 cents' worth of cheap liquor?"

We ought to bring back the morale that we had through the country before prohibition. We ought to get back to a civilized state by placing these things on the basis of other countries where liquor is used. In France and Germany, where liquor is handled as daily consumption and for medicine and food, there is no drunkenness. If we would do that, we would do away with bootleg liquor and all this crime that exists now.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHOEMAKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. In other words, it would cut out drunkenness and promote temperance.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Absolutely; and in the future you would not be pestered by bootleggers and criminals and the corruption of officers and legislators.

If a high tax is placed on liquor, it will encourage the illicit dealer, cause the Government to have another large corps of enforcement officers, and once more cause our jails and penitentiaries to be filled with violators, which will cost the taxpayers far more money than they can collect under a high tax on spirits. Keep the tax down, promote temperance, and eliminate the criminal and gangster. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to find myself in opposition to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], but today we are in complete disagreement. The gentleman wants to place a tax of five to seven dollars a gallon on whisky. In my opinion he seeks to create a condition by an act of Congress that will be equivalent to the condition which existed under the eighteenth amendment. Under the eighteenth amendment the rich could get all the good liquor and wines they desired. To place a tax such as Mr. O'CONNOR suggests on whisky would create that same condition. The rich will be able to

get the good whisky, and the poor will be forced to go to the bootlegger.

There may be a whisky trust in this country; I do not know. Mr. O'CONNOR says there is. If there is a whisky trust in this country, I suggest that he go to the Department of Justice and insist that the Attorney General break up that whisky trust.

The price of liquor must be placed within the reach of all in this country; and if it is not placed within the reach of all, then you are going to have a reaction that all will regret. Are you going to place whisky at a price where the bootlegger will remain in the picture? I have been fighting for many years for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; but I know that if the same conditions are going to exist in the future as existed during the period of prohibition, then we are going to witness a reaction, and gentlemen should not forget there is nothing to prevent another eighteenth amendment or some other such amendment being placed back in the Constitution.

It is not only the duty of the Congress but the duty of every State and city lawmaking body to see that there is no profiteering in liquor, that the public is not gouged, that the price is brought down. We did not repeal the eighteenth amendment so a few could get rich.

Prior to prohibition the best of whiskies, the popular brands, could be bought in this country for \$10, \$11, or \$12 a case in 10-case lots. What is the situation here today? Fifty to seventy-five dollars a case and at some places more.

In the last revenue act we told the people of the country you must pay certain taxes, but if you repeal the eighteenth amendment then those certain taxes will no longer exist. Those specified taxes no longer exist, because the eighteenth amendment was repealed, and we must now fill up that hole in the Treasury. We must get money to meet the normal expenses of the Government between now and July 1, and this is the way you are asked to get it.

I should like to see the tax remain at \$1.10, but it is necessary to go to \$2 in order to raise the needed revenue, and I am in full agreement with the committee; but I say, if you go above that amount, if you listen to some of those who are advocating a high tax, a \$5 or \$7 tax, you are going to create a condition that we will all be sorry for. I hope you will stand behind the committee and that you will pass the bill as reported. That is what we should do, because the committee has convinced us that there will be sufficient revenue raised to fill up the hole that we must take care of by reason of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment with a \$2 a gallon tax. If that is sufficient, why increase it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. With pleasure, to my friend from New York.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman has not made any observation as yet in respect to his attitude in regard to the tax on beer.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, like my friend from New York, Mr. MEAD, I want to see the tax on beer kept as low as possible, because the more beer people drink the less whisky they will drink, which makes for temperance; and I think we will get more money with a reasonable tax on beer and a reasonable tax on whisky than with a high tax. If it were possible, I would say lower the tax on beer, but I remind you we are raising needed revenue.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Always to my friend from Chicago.

Mr. BRITTEN. I regard the gentleman's judgment on the matter of a tax on beer very highly. Does the gentleman think, if the \$5 tax on beer were reduced to \$3, that throughout the country one could get a fair-sized glass of beer for a nickel?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I shall answer the gentleman in this way. My thought will not prevail, because the money is needed to run the expenses of the Government. That is what we are advocating today. We are not taxing beer or whisky because we want to tax it. We are taxing

beer and whisky because we need the money. Do not get away from the fact that it is necessary to raise this money. If conditions permitted, I would favor a much lower tax on beer, whisky, and wines. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate reference has been made to the Rockefeller Foundation and its recommendation that the tax on distilled spirits be \$3 per gallon. Such a tax is utterly indefensible. It is to be remembered that the Rockefeller interests spent millions of dollars in a hopeless attempt to make this country like prohibition. It is now spending millions of dollars in various States and in Washington to prove that prohibition was wrong. This same group is spending millions of dollars in recommending State dispensary systems throughout the country, despite the failure of such systems in States like North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Oklahoma, and in Virginia, where they tried county dispensary systems. Rockefeller is wrong again when he advocates a \$3 tax. I should like to see the tax remain at \$1.10. I am, however, willing to compromise, and I shall offer an amendment tomorrow providing for a rate of \$1.50 per proof gallon.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] stated that we would be able to cope with the bootlegger on the score that there will be a healthy public sentiment against him. The public will develop a healthy sentiment for those from whom it can buy cheapest. If the bootlegger can sell good wares cheaper than the legal dealer, the latter will lose out. If you put a \$2 tax on spirits you put too great a burden on the legal industry, which will suffer. It will not under such circumstances be able to compete successfully with illegal forces.

Some mad wag has said, "Now, that we have repeal, how shall we enforce it?" How, indeed, shall we enforce repeal? Shall we, as was implied by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL], set up a huge enforcement machine, as in the days of prohibition? That would be unfortunate. The enforcement of prohibition gave us enough scandals. We do not wish a recrudescence of them. Furthermore, the Democratic platform, under which the the great Roosevelt was elected, contained a plank that the matter of liquor-control legislation be left to the States, that the matter of enforcement was a State matter, and that it was the province of the Federal Government merely to protect the dry States in the integrity of their choice to remain dry. That is, to prevent the shipment of wet goods into dry States. It shall be the province, therefore, of the Federal Government to deal lightly with this situation. The heavy hand of Federal taxes should not and must not be laid upon the liquor business. Otherwise we play into the hands of the competing bootlegger.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I have not had time to read all the proceedings before the committee; but is there anything in the testimony before the committee to show the value and the amount of property that is being used in this country for the illicit manufacture of whisky at this time and that is available for bootleggers hereafter?

Mr. CELLER. I only received the report of these hearings this morning. I am unable to state whether there are in this record any facts to which the gentleman adverts. There is a splendid wealth of data in this report, and it would repay every man very well to go through it. I know that the interdepartmental committee, which was composed of experts from all the departments, put into the record, on page 330, chart no. 11, the same being entitled "Estimated comparative cost to retail dealers of legal and illegal alcoholic liquors in bottles."

The bootleggers are well organized, are extremely well entrenched in power, are heavily supplied with money, and

now control practically all distributing outlets. They not only supplied all domestic needs but even exported vast quantities of liquor.

During the first few years of repeal it will be most difficult to dislodge them. They did a land-office business during prohibition and will continue to do a land-office business during the next few years. The magnitude of their enterprises is not appreciated by most of us. Prof. Clark Warburton, on the political science faculty of Columbia University, in a recent volume on the Economic Results of Prohibition, indicates, for example, that the estimated amount of beverage spirits consumed in this country in 1929, during prohibition, was 226 million proof gallons. In 1930, still during prohibition, there were consumed 164 million proof gallons. Any outfit that did that much business during prohibition is well armed, figuratively and literally. If we pass a tax of \$2 per proof gallon, they will become further entrenched.

Mr. Parker, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee of Internal Revenue Taxation, has testified that the demand for spirits in 1935 will equal no less than 135 million proof gallons. This is just a shade under the normal demand of the preprohibition years of 1912 and 1913. The average for those years was about 150 million gallons. The bootlegging syndicates wish to continue to do all that business yearly.

While it may be true that the legal distillers can supply that great demand which will exist in 1934 and 1935, by producing young whisky—no old whisky is left, unless we import it, and we are doing very little of that, comparatively—the bootlegging syndicates will procure and smuggle into the country old whisky, that is, quality whisky, and they will thus hold the trade.

The best argument I know to convince one of the need of keeping the taxation low is embodied in chart no. 11, page 330, of the hearings.

CHART NO. 11.—Estimated comparative cost to retail dealers of legal and illegal alcoholic liquors in bottles

	Price to retailer per gallon	Price to local boot- legger per gallon	Price to organized illegal trade per gallon
Beer.....	\$0.56	\$0.64	\$0.72
Spirits.....	1.20	2.20	4.20
Wines.....	1.00	1.20	2.20

You will note that the price to the retailer, per gallon, is \$1.20 in case of spirits, while the price to the local bootlegger is \$2.20, and the price to the organized illegal syndicate, where there is used more protection money, is \$4.20. Now, if they superimpose upon \$1.20 per gallon, the price to the legal trade, the Federal tax of \$2, you get \$3.20. Superimpose upon that, if you happen to be in Pennsylvania, the State tax of \$2, and you get \$5.20. Superimpose upon that a tax of \$1, if you happen to be in New York, and you get \$4.20. Add to those amounts occupational taxes, municipal licenses, and other burdens, and you make it utterly impossible for the legal merchant or the self-respecting citizen engaged in the liquor business to compete with either the local bootlegger or the organized syndicate. The latter will outsell and undercut him. We must keep the tax low, otherwise we get no appreciable amount of taxes collected and we play into the hands of the illegal trader.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] implied that the distillers were profiteering. There has been advanced thus far no tangible evidence of this, and I do not believe that it exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. All parties selling liquor are probably in the flush of great business due to excessive drinking, and they are enjoying fair profits and doing a healthy and good business. It may not last. The distillers, however, are not without their difficulties. The State of Pennsylvania, for example, passed a law inflicting a tax of \$2 per gallon on all

floor stocks and required that tax to be paid in 90 days. The enforcement of this act would have bankrupted many of the distillers in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania was compelled to change its statute. It is now afforded some modicum of relief from this oppressive law. Other States are running wild in their desire to get what they believe to be untold riches in the form of excessive taxes from the distilleries. Let us be fair and not be swept off our feet by any emotional appeals or charges that may be groundless. I believe the charges of profiteering are groundless.

If the distillers, however, are charging improper prices, we have a complete remedy. Increase the importation of whisky, for example, from Canada, England, and elsewhere. Such added supply will quickly force a drop in the domestic prices. For example, there is about 25 million gallons of American-type rye, of old and mature whisky, in Canada that could readily be brought in. We only have 1,000,000 gallons of whisky in this country today. At the advent of repeal we had 8,000,000 gallons of original-gage whisky. This was equivalent to about 4,000,000 gallons regaged. The 8,000,000 gallons shrunk to 4,000,000 as a result of evaporation and seepage over the period of years.

The 4,000,000 gallons of regaged whisky are now reduced to 1,000,000 gallons. It is quite essential, therefore, to bring in a large quantity of old and mature whisky from abroad. Otherwise the American public will be drinking colored alcohol, tinged with a little whisky.

The F.A.C.A., namely, the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, operating under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, are in charge of the quotas of imported goods. Hon. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., is the chairman of the F.A.C.A. He and his colleagues, Messrs. Miller, Green, Lowry, Rhees, Davis, Willingham, Joyce, and others, are doing a very fine piece of work. They work under the most trying conditions. I know for a fact that they have been working day and night at the Transportation Building in an endeavor to answer the demands of thousands of importers all clamoring for goods. They have worked fearlessly and painstakingly. I do not agree, however, with the very narrow restrictions placed upon them by the State Department and the Administration. They should be given greater latitude, so that the quotas might be widened to the end that more goods could be brought in. In that case, pressure would be removed from them, the importers would be satisfied, the supply of goods in this country would be increased, and there would be no danger of profiteering on the part of the distillers or anyone else.

I take this opportunity of emphatically disagreeing with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. He has unduly disparaged our sister Republic France and has drawn from President Roosevelt's remarks unwarranted inferences. His aspersions on French wines are entirely unwarranted. His intemperate and ill-advised statements concerning France will do more harm than good.

Statements have been made today about the vast business that the distillers did during prohibition. Intimations appear in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] that the bootlegger is supplied by the distiller. I make reference to page 380 of the hearings which contains a detailed statement of the amount of distilled whisky withdrawn on payment of tax over the period from 1901 to 1932, inclusive.

Statement of the amount of distilled whisky withdrawn on payment of tax over the period from 1901 to 1932, inclusive

Year:	Gallons
1901.....	57,117,571.7
1902.....	54,948,215.3
1903.....	45,118,385.3
1904.....	45,611,673.3
1905.....	45,234,977.6
1906.....	49,543,257.7
1907.....	58,703,504.8
1908.....	50,099,838.0
1909.....	62,546,366.1
1910.....	67,290,394.7
1911.....	72,682,389.8
1912.....	72,355,460.6
1913.....	76,244,441.4
1914.....	72,866,983.3
1915.....	63,614,609.0
1916.....	69,468,144.9
1917.....	83,591,339.9

Statement of the amount of distilled whisky withdrawn on payment of tax, etc.—Continued

Year:	Gallons
1918	56,222,591.6
1919	62,142,793.8
1920	6,187,984.3
1921	9,118,325.2
1922	2,676,022.3
1923	1,761,566.4
1924	1,822,869.0
1925	1,926,621.5
1926	1,892,003.1
1927	1,648,078.2
1928	1,545,618.2
1929	1,534,983.2
1930	1,405,706.5
1931	1,202,510.5
1932	937,382.1

It will be seen that in the last few years of prohibition, less than an average of 1½ million gallons of whisky were withdrawn, while in 1932 the figures show less than 1,000,000 gallons.

I am quite sure that had the Celler bill not passed, which allowed doctors to prescribe without let or hindrance, any amount of whisky, based on their professional judgment, thereby increasing the demand for medicinal whisky sold by the distillers, a number of distillers would have gone through bankruptcy.

I make so bold as to suggest a progressive tax. The first year let there be a tax of \$1.10, let there be a tax of \$1.50 the second year, and \$2 the third year.

The great battles between the bootlegger and the legal trader will be waged the first year. By the end of the first year, the legal trade will have a good foothold, which foothold will be increased the second year. The legal trade will then be ready and willing to pay a tax of \$2 per proof gallon. By that time they will have recaptured the trade now held by the bootlegger.

Bring over the English goods, the old goods, so there can be blended with what small supplies we have and with the young whisky that is being manufactured some older whisky, in order that the Nation can get a palatable, decent drink if the people want that type of beverage. The F.A.C.A., the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, is working within very narrow limits. They have been instructed to keep these quotas as narrow as possible. This is wrong. The Congress has the right to say what shall or shall not come in. I do not believe any of these orders that gave rise to the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, well intentioned as they may have been, has any constitutionality about it. Nevertheless, without going into the legal phase of the situation, we must instruct the administration to increase these quotas for the health of the Nation so we will get a decent, a more mature, and better whisky.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care at this time to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the tax proposal before the House in the present bill. There seems to be a sharp division of opinion as to the advisability of a \$2 tax or a higher tax. Personally, I was in favor of a lower tax. In the committee I wanted to make the tax \$1.10. I suggested that as the tax for 1 year, but I realized that we could not in any way bind a future Congress as to what the tax should be. I felt we should leave it at \$1.10 for the time being, although I felt I might be subjected to the criticism that I was not anxious to secure all the revenue possible toward balancing the Budget of ordinary expenditures.

However, that was not my viewpoint at all. I realize that under any circumstances the revenue produced from this tax is going to be extremely disappointing as a Budget-balancing item.

The message was broadcast in speeches to the several States in urging the repeal of the eighteenth amendment that not only would it be a profitable source of revenue for the Federal Government, but that here was a tax opportunity for the States, here was a new El Dorado, a new gold mine of revenue for them to tap, and lighten their burden of taxation; and yet, strange to say, the Interdepartmental Commission when reporting to the Ways and Means Com-

mittee advised that we make the tax \$2.60 and that of this amount 20 percent, or 52 cents, be returned to the States on the basis, of course, that they would collect no other tax than their ordinary occupational taxes, such as they collected before prohibition.

I think you all realize the difficulty of enacting such a proposition into law. I think as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL], stated, the difficulties were almost insurmountable. In the first place, several States had already enacted legislation laying gallonage taxes, which had never been done before, and it necessitated an agreement on the part of the 48 States that they would levy none other than an occupational tax. Then came the problem of distribution; how should it be distributed—on production, on consumption, on population, or on what basis could it be done, and what would the States do with the money when they received it without special legislative action on the subject? So we finally decided to discard the plan to have the Federal Government collect the tax and allocate a portion of it to the States.

I think there is some logic in the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] that the thing which will prevent bootlegging is not a low tax but low liquor prices. We are figuring from the tax down to the price of liquor whereas we should figure from the price of the liquor up to the tax.

Witnesses appeared before the committee who said good whisky could be made for less than 15 cents a gallon. One man appeared there and stated, giving costs covering a 4-year period, including the original investment, including leakage, including evaporation, that whisky aged for 4 years could be produced at a cost of \$1.20 a gallon. This is 30 cents a quart. Even if the tax was \$5 a gallon, it would be only \$1.25 a quart. Adding 30 cents to this would make the price \$1.55. So with a fair margin of profit good whisky could still be sold for \$2 a quart. The present tax is only \$1.10 and yet the retailers are charging from 5 to 8 dollars a quart. This fact vindicates the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. It seems to me this is a thing we ought to do.

From the picture painted at the hearings the bootlegging industry never had a finer background than at the present time, and we are facing greater difficulties than we did during the days of prohibition, if you please.

The committee had witnesses before it who stated that the bootleggers were ready now to sell wholesale dealers 1,000 gallons of liquor for \$1,000. You will find in the hearing that one witness said he wondered if he could recoup his family fortunes in the business his father and grandfather had been in. He did not believe he could compete with the illicit industry today. He said they owned steamers, they owned high-powered speedboats, they owned fleets of trucks, they owned thousands of automobiles, they owned airplanes; and he said that one of the pilots of an airplane had recently resigned from the liquor business and bought the airplane and was going to bootleg Chinamen in from Mexico. He said that in many cities of the United States liquor could be delivered within 30 minutes, guaranteed, by bootleg traffic. He said if one lived in a nice apartment a well-dressed young lady in a finely equipped automobile would appear and deliver the package. But he said one had to pay the price, a good price; that one paid for what the label described, although that did not always indicate the kind of whisky the bottle contained.

So it remains difficult for anybody to determine whether or not there is a rate that will prevent the continuation of illegal traffic. Certainly, if we do not lay a decent tax on it, we are going to be tremendously disappointed as regards the revenue to the Federal Government, because, remember, we repealed by the President's proclamation around \$220,000,000 in taxes that were laid for the amortization of the N.R.A. bond issue of \$3,300,000,000, and this must be subtracted from the total revenue that is brought in as a result of the tax on liquor. So, I repeat, I am afraid it will be intensely disappointing.

What I wanted to refer to more particularly was this: That it seems we missed a point when we did not allow some differential for nonbeverage alcohol used in the industries. One or two witnesses appeared before us representing the flavoring extract manufacturers, the National Association of Fruit and Flavoring Sirup Manufacturers, manufacturers of soda-water flavors, and various commodities of this kind. We are assessing a very high tax on alcohol used in the industries. At the present time we are trying to relieve industry of as many burdens as we possibly can in order to spur it to renewed activities. Now, on 190 proof it will cause an increase of \$2.84 per gallon, or 110 percent, in the cost of this most important ingredient entering into the manufacture of such common household necessities as lemon extract and vanilla flavoring and various articles of that character.

There will be no danger of diversion for beverage purposes as there was in the prohibition days. Under the regulations of the Treasury Department diversion for beverage purposes had almost disappeared from the picture. The Flavoring Extract Manufacturers Association, through its representative, stated:

It seems to our association and our industry that the common necessities of life should not be injured by having the alcohol they use included with the alcohol on which the proposed higher tax is to be levied. We ask once more for a tax of \$1.10 a proof-gallon on nonbeverage alcohol, and the inclusion in the tax of the permit features of the National Prohibition Act of 1920, if the committee after full consideration of the case deems the retention of the permit system advisable.

It seems to me we have overlooked this important matter, and I hope that before the consideration of the bill is entirely closed we will give some attention to the various industries that use nonbeverage alcohol.

Let me say that in 1917, when the tax was \$2.20 on nonbeverage alcohol, we had \$3.20 on the beverage alcohol, and again, in 1918, when we raised beverage alcohol to \$6.40, we let the tax on nonbeverage alcohol remain at \$2.20.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent I agree with the committee on this bill. I feel that a \$2 tax is a reasonable tax. I am also in accord with the committee insofar as the wine tax is concerned, but I differ with the committee on the so-called "beer tax."

In looking at the bill you get the impression that the tax on beer was \$6 prior to prohibition, and that they are reducing it now to \$5, a reduction of \$1. The truth of the matter is that the tax from the year 1862 until the year 1914 was \$1, with the exception of a year or two immediately after the Civil War and a year or two immediately after the Spanish War, at which time the tax was increased to \$2.

The following was the tax before prohibition: The tax on beer from 1862 to March 3, 1863, was \$1 a barrel; from March 3, 1863, to March 31, 1864, 60 cents a barrel; from April 1, 1864, to June 13, 1898, was \$1 a barrel; from June 14, 1898, to June 30, 1901, during the Spanish-American War, the tax was raised to \$2 a barrel; from July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, it was reduced to \$1.60 a barrel; on July 1, 1902, it was again reduced to \$1, and continued at this rate until October 22, 1914.

I contended before the Ways and Means Committee, as shown at page 355 of the committee hearings, when they were considering the Collier bill, that we would not obtain under the \$5 tax a 5-cent glass of beer. I contended at that time that beer would sell at from \$10 to \$12 per barrel wholesale. In the city of Baltimore beer is selling today from \$12 to \$14 a barrel. At that time our colleague, Mr. Ragon, who is now on the Federal bench, had this to say, at page 356, speaking about the nickel glass of beer:

As I recall, the representatives of the breweries testified that if we make that tax no higher than \$5, they can still furnish the nickel glass of beer. One of them said that what this country needed now more than anything else was a 5-cent glass of beer.

I contended that that was not so. I stated that you could not obtain a nickel glass of beer under those circumstances.

I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, whether you have a nickel glass of beer in your city or in your State. We have it in the city of Baltimore, yes, in the residential section where cheap rent prevails, but the men who sell a 12-ounce glass for a nickel are not making a living. They are just simply working for the breweries.

Let us provide a small profit for the little man who is trying to make a living honestly. Give them a tax of \$2 on beer, and, in my opinion, you will permit them to make a living.

Bear in mind that in April, when beer was permitted, we had in Baltimore, taking that city as an example, two breweries operating. Perhaps a \$5 tax at that time was somewhat justified, because they would profit by it and the breweries would profit. Today in the city of Baltimore we have eight breweries. What is the consequence? They are laying off men. They are not producing any more because the men cannot pay 10 cents for a glass of beer.

Let me just give you some information in reference to the reduction of income. Some of the Members will recall I stated on the floor of the House when there was discussion about \$225,000,000 and \$250,000,000, that you would not get it. In July this amounted to \$16,644,557.30; in August, \$16,301,018.49; and in November, \$8,040,943.55. You can see now when there is more production your income is less. My contention is that if you reduce the tax to \$2 you will give the farmer an opportunity to sell more grain and you will cause increased employment in the breweries. You will allow the man who desires to sell a legitimate glass of beer to make an honest living, and you will receive as much revenue from the \$2 tax as you are collecting now on a \$5 tax.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think we would get infinitely more revenue if the tax was \$1 instead of \$2, in the same way that you get more revenue from a 1-cent postage stamp on first-class mail than you get from 3 cents, and for the same reason that when the railroads were permitted to reduce their passenger rates to 2 cents a mile instead of 3 cents they took in more revenue?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am not prepared at this time to advocate cutting the tax down to \$1, as it was before prohibition. I think living conditions, at the time I spoke of, from 1862 up to 1914, were quite different from what they are today. The working man demands more salary and I believe that the men and women who are working in the breweries and conducting retail stores and so forth, are entitled to a living wage, and I believe a tax of \$2 at this time to protect the Government is a fair tax.

Mr. MEAD and Mr. HEALEY rose.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman's main point is with respect to imposing a tax sufficient to permit the sale of a wholesome 5-cent glass of beer?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is right, and that is what I contended in the special session.

Mr. HEALEY. My question was along the same line. Does the gentleman feel that if we reduced the tax on beer to \$3 or \$2.50 that that would result in a 5-cent glass of beer?

Mr. PALMISANO. You would get a 5-cent glass of beer and I believe the Government would get as much revenue as it will get under a \$5 tax.

We have been talking about the bootlegger and one thing and another here this afternoon. I stood on this floor advocating the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, not because I personally cared for drink. I advocated it because of temperance, and the only way you are going to get temperance is to have personal responsibility, and the only way you can get personal responsibility is to say to the States, "Cut out the gallonage tax, cut out the excise tax, and have a good, strong, high liquor license tax, and keep the distilleries and the breweries away from the retail trade."

When you do this, it will mean that a man who attempts to get into the business must invest from \$2,000 to \$5,000; and if he violates the law, you take that license away from him and close up his place of business. From my experience I can guarantee that you will have no violators and you will have no bootleggers, because they will not tolerate them.

So I say that when the proper time comes let us adopt an amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PALMISANO. Let us adopt an amendment making it \$2 or \$2.50 and let us go back to our various States and advocate a high license tax with a provision that when they are convicted of violating the law they will be barred from ever going into the business; and if they own the property, padlock it, if you please, or prevent them from selling liquor or beer on such property. I believe in some cases, where a landlord is interested, you might make an exception in the first instance, but in the second instance make him protect himself by getting a bond from his tenant that the law will not be violated; and in the event the place is closed down, I say that the man must give a bond to protect the rent to the landlord.

If the States will adopt a law of this kind, we will never have the cry that we had when we asked for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. We want temperance; we must get temperance in the States by a high-license system and by divorcing the breweries and the distilleries from the retail trade. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWNING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRONG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 6131 is a tax bill dealing with the rates of taxes to be levied upon intoxicating liquors. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] urges a higher rate of tax be levied upon liquors than the amount mentioned in the bill. He states he was an ardent advocate of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and voters were urged to vote for repeal because of the great amount of revenue that would flow into the Federal, State, county, and municipal treasuries from the tax on liquor if the sale of same was legalized. Mr. O'CONNOR says the people were sold on this idea and voted for repeal.

Just to keep the record straight, may I say, in 1914 when the liquor traffic prevailed, \$1,045,628,955 of revenue was collected by the Government, when in 1929 under national prohibition the revenue received by the Government was \$4,036,219,000, a gain of 300 percent in the revenues received by the Government under national prohibition; therefore, the eighteenth amendment could not have caused the loss in revenue and created the tax burden.

While considering this tax measure it was also claimed more liquor was consumed during national prohibition than before its adoption. It is easy to make assertions. All know more homes were built during the pending of the eighteenth amendment than in any like period within the history of the United States Government; more dry goods, groceries, and dairy products bought, bank deposits increased immensely, wages for the laboring man were never higher, more children in school and more young men and women attending our colleges and universities than ever before. There is just one answer to all this. Money which was spent for liquor before national prohibition was spent for the necessities of the home, and for educating the children of the Nation.

It is also well known to all citizens that the eighteenth amendment was in the hands of its enemies practically the entire time from the date of its adoption until it was

repealed; that officials whose duty it was to uphold the amendment and enforce the law absolutely refused to do so but encouraged the violation of the law.

The advocates of repeal of the eighteenth amendment also urged same in order to bring about true temperance. After repeal was effected, one of the leaders who aided in bringing it about said: "The biggest job before us now is to create true temperance throughout the Nation." I want to add, true temperance is what all good people earnestly desire. If the people who advocated true temperance in securing repeal of national prohibition have a plan that will create such conditions, all citizens should actively and sincerely give undivided support to same, and it is hoped the plan will be put into effect at an early date, for in many localities arrests for drunkenness have increased more than 100 percent since legalizing the sale of beer.

I was opposed to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and have at all times urged respect and obedience to all laws, for in no other way can life and property be secure. Those who favored repeal of the eighteenth amendment are dictating the laws for the control of the liquor traffic. When such laws are enacted, I hope all citizens will obey same and loyally aid in the enforcement thereof.

But before closing my remarks allow me to make one other suggestion in order to keep the records straight. The eighteenth amendment was repealed by a small minority of the voters of the Nation. In several of the States the vote in the election for repeal was exceedingly light, and in no State, from the information I have, did more than 50 percent of the legal voters participate in the election. It has been remarked on the floor of the House many times during the consideration of this bill that the people of the United States have repealed the eighteenth amendment. It would have been more in keeping with the records to have said that a minority of the people of the United States have repealed the eighteenth amendment.

In conclusion, I wish to say our President is sincerely and actively putting forth all efforts possible to bring relief to the people of our Nation, I believe, and all citizens should loyally support his efforts. The different departments of Government have issued statements quite often showing progress made in bringing relief to the people. I have distributed several thousand of such statements to the people of Texas, and believe all should aid in every way possible in extending all measures of relief offered by our President and Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, about 4 years ago when I was a candidate for Congress, I happened to be the only one in my district at that time who was a candidate for that office in favor of the outright repeal of prohibition. I did not think when we had finally accomplished it that we were going to let the bootlegger dictate our taxing policy on the beverages that have just come back to us.

I notice there have been two arguments advanced as to why the tax should be low, and one is that we can keep the bootlegger from remaining in this system of ours.

This seems to indicate that we admit that our Government is unable to enforce the law even when the people are in favor of it or that the American people, now able to get legal liquor, will violate the law.

I have analyzed a little bit this report of the committee, and I find that they increased the tax on wine about 150 percent over what it used to be; they increase the tax on beer about 400 percent over what is used to be; they likewise propose to reduce the tax on champagne, the millionaires' drink, about 50 percent, but are only going to increase the tax on whisky 90 percent. This is a real break for the whisky interests of this country.

It certainly has been proven that no matter what the tax on whisky is, the price still remains as high as ever. Out in my State we have not got around to imposing a State tax on liquor, but it costs just as much to buy liquor in my

State today as it does to buy it over in a State where they have a high tax on it.

If we put the tax on whisky low, the State legislatures that can be convened in almost a day will make up the difference in the State tax. If you made the tax on whisky 10 cents a gallon, the Governors of a good many States, frantic for some more revenue, because they need it, would call their legislatures into session and they would immediately hoist their State taxes.

But I do not think the question of State taxing should enter into our consideration at this time. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] advocates raising the tax from \$2 to \$5. I am in favor of that, although I disagree with the gentleman on the proposition of increasing the beer tax. I think the beer tax ought to go down to \$2 a barrel. I have some figures here. I managed to get a report of the taxes from seven Western States from the Internal Revenue Department. My own State, Wisconsin, today is raising one seventh of the beer tax of the Nation. Unfortunately, we do not get nearly that much back. Anyone who knows anything about breweries knows that a brewery employs more men per gallonage production than does a distillery. If we lower the tax on beer, we will increase its consumption. That was my hope when I favored repeal. I hoped we would not make the price of hard liquor so low that we would encourage an increased consumption of hard liquor. I never believed that that was the aim of repeal. I never supported repeal upon that basis. I do not want to see an increased consumption of hard liquor in this country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] said that they could get 250 glasses of beer out of a barrel of beer. The bartenders in New York are not as good as the bartenders in Wisconsin. I have been told by the bartenders that you can get about 400 to 500 12-ounce glasses of beer out of a barrel. It is impossible today, with our State tax, to sell beer at 5 cents a glass and make any money. With 250 glasses of beer, and I take Mr. O'CONNOR's figures, the only return to the saloon keeper, if it were sold at 5 cents a glass, would be \$10.50. There is a \$6 tax on it now, and there is a dollar State tax on it, and the breweries charge \$16 for it. I think they are charging too much. I know that beer is being made today by small breweries in my State for less than \$3 a barrel; but, taking the cost of \$3 a barrel and adding the tax to it, it costs the brewery \$9 to turn out a barrel of beer. If we reduce the tax on beer, we can bring back the 5-cent glass of beer and we can increase its consumption, in that way keeping down the consumption of hard liquor.

I had hoped that we would not regard the bootlegger any more in this system of ours, that under the new deal we would get better enforcement than we have had during the 12 years of Republican enforcement. I do not think our taxing policy should take into consideration the future continuance of the bootlegger in business.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does not the gentleman believe that if we were to have a tax of \$5 a gallon on whisky there would be a great deal of bootlegging in moonshine whisky?

Mr. O'MALLEY. I can only answer that by stating my belief that if the American people can get good liquor at a reasonable price they will not patronize the bootlegger.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman speaks of a reasonable price. With a tax of \$5 for the Federal Government, and leaving out entirely any State tax, but adding a couple of dollars for the manufacturer, that would bring it up to \$7 and more per gallon for whisky, when people can buy moonshine whisky for \$2. Does the gentleman think under those circumstances that the moonshiner would go out of business?

Mr. O'MALLEY. I do not know whether he would go out of business or not, but I think the Government can put him out of business, and that a \$5 tax on whisky will not bring up the price to the consumer if the Whisky Trust is broken up.

Mr. BOILEAU. But with the enforcement left in charge of the States, if the Federal Government is to put them out

of business, under that handicap, it would have to put on another tax of a dollar to defray the expense.

Mr. O'MALLEY. A \$5 tax on a gallon of whisky would make a pint of whisky bear a tax of about 60 cents. I would like to be able to buy a pint of good whisky for about \$1.50. I think the difference between 60 cents and \$1.50 is quite enough for the manufacturer.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is twice as much as it cost before prohibition.

Mr. HOEPEL. And you can buy good bootleg liquor in San Francisco for 35 cents.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes; and the bootlegger has to manufacture it and get somebody to sell it, the same as the Whisky Trust that is charging 10 times that price.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO] intimated that an effort would be made to lower the tax on beer to \$2 when the bill is under consideration under the 5-minute rule. It occurs to me that an effort should be made to diminish the tax on beer. I would like to have the gentleman's idea as to what the tax on beer should be.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I think the tax is plenty at \$2, but I would be willing to compromise on \$3 because then we would have made an advance.

Mr. MEAD. And it occurs to me that a unified effort should be made so that we could bring that about.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, before I came down here I was convinced that our tax on hard liquor ought not to exceed \$1.10, which was the old tax. I think that we have one of the most difficult tax situations in the State of Ohio of any State in the Union.

At the last November election we adopted an old-age pension law that will cost the State in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000 a year. We adopted a 10-mill limitation on real estate, which will necessitate about \$18,000,000 more revenue being raised from some additional source.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] said that the tax on liquor does not always determine the selling price. But if we should levy a tax in excess of \$2 a gallon, the tax recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means—and I think we owe those gentlemen a debt of gratitude for the many long hours they have spent in the study of these perplexing questions—I believe, regardless of whether we make the tax \$1 or \$2 a gallon, that a State like the State of Ohio will immediately levy the highest possible tax they can on the gallonage consumed in that State.

We have already adopted by State legislation a form of State monopoly for liquor control. This has been very distasteful to many of our people. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO] said awhile ago, I personally favor giving the little fellow in business—the man who is now handling beer—an opportunity to dispense wine and liquor and make a living thereby.

Now, I want to say a word about various subjects that have been discussed here and especially as regards moonshine whisky. We have several different grades of moonshine in Ohio. As another gentleman said to me, in many cases the genuine distilled corn liquor or rye liquor back in the hills and valleys of Ohio is the highest grade liquor we are dispensing today.

Two weeks ago the Columbus Citizen gathered up a number of samples of liquor sold by the drug stores. We have an emergency provision that permits drug stores to sell liquor for 60 days. They had three brands. One brand of bonded whisky, 16 years old, sold for \$3.50 a pint; the second was a blend of whisky selling for \$1.85 a pint; and the third was the Stratesville moonshine, which, I have no doubt, is known to every Member of the Ohio delegation. [Laughter.] I did not mean that they had personal knowledge of it, but they

have heard of it. The Stratesville moonshine, by chemical test and analysis, proved to be the purest liquor of the three. They found that grade no. 2, selling for \$1.85, some of it was blended with liquor that formerly was denatured but had been precipitated and blended into whisky.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] 1 additional minute.

Mr. TRUAX. They found that all of these second grades were artificially colored with caramel, and they found that grade no. 1, selling for \$3.50, was cut three times. The original whisky, 16 years old, was cut three times with equal parts of distilled water and pure grain alcohol. So I say to you gentlemen that we have a perplexing problem on our hands. In the name of justice to all the people who are going to consume liquor because they have the appetites, let us keep the tax as low as possible, because when the various States get through with their taxes that liquor will have to sell for at least \$2 a quart, which cannot compete with our good old Stratesville liquor at \$4 a gallon. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with those who maintain that if we put an exorbitant tax on liquor we will have bootleggers. I am not going to say any more about that because I know I cannot persuade anybody, no matter how much time I may consume in argument, to believe as I believe. However, I do want to say something about a statement made on the floor this afternoon in regard to France. It has been said that an embargo should be put on French wines, and the gentleman who made the statement also said, or at least I understood him to say, that the French people were cheats. I disagree with that gentleman. I will agree with him in saying that some of the French people are cheats. In fact we do not have to go out of this country to find cheaters. In every nation in the world there are cheats; but I do think that the people in France, as a class, are a great people; and I do believe that the people in every country in the world are great people. It is true there are unprincipled demagogues in every nation; and I do not doubt, if it were left to the masses of the people in France and every other country which owes the United States money, they would pay their honest debts. It is the crooked politicians of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and in the United States, who do not want to pay their debts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening so long to a discussion of taxes on whisky and beer, that I thought it behooved me to come here and say a word about the wine sections of this pending bill.

No one is interested in having the taxes on the particular commodity in which he is interested increased. Dry wine of itself is an agricultural commodity pure and simple, naturally fermenting without the aid of anything except nature itself. We asked the committee in all seriousness to consider the elimination of any tax upon dry wine or wines under 14 percent alcohol capacity. We presented a schedule of taxes which we felt would be fair and which should be the maximum if the committee adopted any taxation at all for wines.

I want to take this opportunity of saying that the Ways and Means Committee acted fairly and courteously to the wine producers and the wine growers of California, and that the schedule they have set out in their bill is one that will be acceptable and that will prevent bootlegging and still will encourage the development of the wine industry throughout California.

I regret to hear that any Member of the House presented the suggestion that we should place an embargo against the importation of wine from any other country. I say this

because, as one who has been a grower himself and who has been interested, though not at the present time, in the wine industry, I feel that future years to come will need the addition of foreign wines. We have sufficient tariff protection against the importation of cheap wines at the present time to keep those out. We need the addition of foreign wines so that we may educate the people of the United States to the sane and temperate drinking with their meals of what really is a food and should not be looked upon as an intoxicating liquor. Wine should never be classed or grouped with whisky or high wine spirits, brandy, and the others. I say, therefore, that I do hope that no suggestion will be made as to an embargo preventing the importation of wines from any other country. In so speaking I assure you I represent not only myself but the wine producers of the State of California. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEIDEMAN].

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Chairman, you have heard a lot of argument about the fact that if the tax on liquor is high the bootlegger will be in competition with good liquor. I do not think so. I think the people of this country are a part of this new deal and that they will stand behind the law-enforcement officials and convict bootleggers as fast as they are brought into court. I happen to be a lawyer. I have seen the action of juries. In the city of Detroit the city officials got very few convictions for violations of the liquor laws for several years. Now in the vast majority of cases the juries are convicting the accused. They want the laws of the United States and of the State of Michigan upheld. The rank and file of the people throughout the country are the same way. I do not think we will have much trouble with that. I think the people will stand behind the Government on this law, no matter what the tax is.

PROMOTION OF TEMPERANCE SHOULD BE AIM OF LAWS

I believe that the prohibition law was repealed by the people of this country to return to them that personal liberty of which they were deprived by the eighteenth amendment. No one wanted to repeal the eighteenth amendment to develop whisky drinkers, but it was repealed to promote the cause of temperance. We can do more to promote temperance by giving the working people of this country a good glass of beer, which is a wholesome beverage when used with moderation, than we can in any other manner. It is our duty to see that they get it without the imposition of an exorbitant tax.

I am confident that the law-enforcing agencies will enter upon the enforcement of our laws with a new zeal and vigor when those laws are such that they themselves can conscientiously enforce. They will be backed up by the citizens throughout the length and breadth of the land.

I want to compliment the committee on the wonderful work they have done in this bill. I am satisfied with it, although if I were on the committee I might have urged a lower tax on beer in order that we might bring back the 5-cent glass of beer. The trouble in this field is that the brewers are trying to recoup in the period of a year the losses they have suffered throughout the years, but I am satisfied that eventually we shall have the nickel glass of beer back generally. We have a nickel glass of beer in Detroit and the people are satisfied with it.

We are going along with the committee in its program. I am satisfied the people of this country are going to stand right behind this House, right behind the Senate, right behind the President, and the law-enforcement officials of the country in their campaign against violators of the law.

As this is a revenue-producing bill I am going to stand by the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this tax bill. Every citizen in my district is interested in getting good liquor, good beer at a cheap price. That is the primary thing of interest to them. I am going to go along on this tax bill with their viewpoint in mind.

I know that at the present time what other gentlemen from large cities have said is the truth in regard to beer. The man who sells beer, who handles the glass of beer at retail, is today working for the brewery. He is not making a living at it. He can hardly pay his rent. This is the truth. The places which sell beer at a nickel a glass are not making any money. They are just cutting each other's throat in the business and there really is no profit in the retail end of the beer business today.

We could help this situation by making the tax on beer about \$3 a barrel. This still would be \$2 more than it was in the days before prohibition.

We should not expect the beer and liquor industry to carry the full load of this taxation. They are industries just as much as any other industry. We must bear in mind in this matter of taxation that our State governments are bankrupt, that they are badly in need of new revenues and will look to these new industries. We must take this into consideration and not overload them with Federal taxes.

Now, of course, I want to go along with the administration on this bill, I want to go along with the committee, but I would like to see liquor taxes lowered.

I think that \$1.10 per gallon is plenty, and that \$2 is too high a tax on whisky. I know that in Detroit today a 5-gallon can of moonshine can be brought for \$15. This is fairly good whisky. It certainly is much better than this so-called "blended whisky" that is being sold at the liquor stores at \$3 and \$4 per quart. The average citizen cannot afford to pay these high prices for legal whisky. If the price of legitimate whisky is too high, these fellows will buy the cheaper moonshine whisky, as they have been doing right along.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to section 3, the section dealing with perfumes. As I understand it, under the amendment of the old law all perfumes that are imported into this country which contain distilled spirits, regardless of whether they are denatured spirits or not, would come under the new tax of \$2. Let us say a manufacturer in this country is able to make a domestic perfume with distilled spirits with a denaturant in it. The denaturant carries no tax whatsoever. So that, in effect, unless, in my judgment, a proviso is put in excepting perfumes made with spirits containing a denaturant the duty on them is increased by 90 cents a proof gallon. Is this correct?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The denaturant is tax free only when it is for industrial uses.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman is correct, but use for the manufacture of perfume is an industrial use. I am only pointing out in this section 3 that where it refers to the old law—I have it right here, under denaturant—and also the statement contained in the report of the committee that it is believed that this increase is improper, as perfume manufacturers in this country using distilled spirits not denatured will be obliged to pay a \$2 additional tax. If perfume is made out of alcohol that has been denatured, under the definition of the old law, which goes back to 1906 and which defines as denatured, alcohol that is made unfit for beverage purposes and used for nonbeverage purposes, the importer bringing in even that same kind of distilled spirits, although it might be denatured, will have to pay an additional 90 cents. This will be true unless some proviso is put in the bill exempting the manufacturer from this additional tax where he uses denatured alcohol or distilled spirits containing some kind of a denaturant as agreed upon in the definition of denatured alcohol.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

May I say in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] this afternoon, that in view of the fact that our committee is to have a session tomorrow morning the chairman may be willing to have this matter brought up for consideration; not for hearing, but for consideration, at that time, before the bill is read.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That would be entirely satisfactory. I was just going to remark to the gentleman from Connecticut that the matter could be brought up under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GOSS. I am only trying to see that the matter is cleared up. It may be fully taken care of by the present language of the bill, but I am simply pointing the matter out to the committee.

Mr. TREADWAY. Give the committee a chance to consider the matter tomorrow morning before the bill is read.

Mr. GOSS. I am calling attention to the possibility of this additional 90-cent cost as against imported perfume.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I may say to the gentleman it will be entirely satisfactory to have it taken up with the committee in the morning.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. GUEVARA].

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the Resident Commissioner 2 minutes.

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Chairman, I especially regret that I have to take up the precious time of the Members of this House who are now engaged in the discussion of a very important question for the American people. But the Philippine question is something which is vital to the Government of the United States. This is why I ask you to permit me to address you for a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my unavoidable duty to inform this House of the concurrent resolution of the Philippine Legislature, no. 46, declining to accept Public Act No. 311, Seventy-second Congress, commonly known as the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law, enacted by the Congress of the United States on January 17, 1933.

I am officially informed that the reasons which prompted such resolution were:

* * * the provisions of the law affecting the trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands would seriously imperil the economic, social, and political institutions of this country and might defeat its avowed purpose to secure independence to the Philippine Islands at the end of the transition period; because the immigration clause is objectionable and offensive to the Filipino people; because the powers of the High Commissioner are too indefinite; and finally because the military, naval, and other reservations provided for in the said act are inconsistent with true independence, violate national dignity, and are subject to misunderstanding.

Mr. Chairman, to the Members of this House who voted for the passage of the act (no. 311), I wish to reiterate my profound gratitude for their unselfish efforts to solve with justice to all and with malice toward none the problem of American-Filipino relationship. I do not find any reason to be regretful of my past stand concerning the act. I still believe, and so assert, that if we take into consideration the circumstances under which the Seventy-second Congress enacted the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law, we cannot fail to reach the conclusion that it was the best obtainable, for it proposed to reconcile the many conflicting interests existing at the time. I would be recreant to myself, however, if I did not say with all candor that act 311 cannot be as perfect as we might wish. No human work can be perfect. Certainly we all admit, and gratefully recognize, that the Congress in enacting said law was inspired only by the highest motives to fulfill the duty of the United States toward the Filipino people and to satisfy their wishes and ambitions. The Philippine Legislature in its Concurrent Resolution No. 46 acknowledged this good faith and friendly spirit when it expressed its full appreciation of the good will shown by the Congress of the United States in its efforts to finally settle the Philippine question by enacting Public Act No. 311.

I am now placed in the position of fulfilling what I consider to be my patriotic duty, to advocate a solution of the

American-Filipino problem in accordance with the expressed wishes of the majority of the constitutional representatives of my people. My past stand should not be placed above that of the majority of the Philippine Legislature. There comes a time when personal opinion must be subrogated to that of the majority. I believe in democratic institutions, and under their aegis the principles of liberty and justice are better secured. I only regret that, largely on my account, many of the Members of this House voted for the bill in the belief that my stand was an expression of the will of the Filipino people whom I represent. To those of my colleagues I beg that they consider my support of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law as prompted by high motives and patriotic impulses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, 13 years ago President Wilson, in his message to Congress, said concerning the Philippine Islands the following:

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.

The Democratic Party pledged itself in unequivocal terms as to the immediate grant of independence to the Philippines.

The Philippine plank inserted and adopted by the Democratic Convention of 1920 says:

We favor the granting of independence without unnecessary delay to the 10,500,000 inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

In 1924 and again in 1928 the Democratic Party adopted in convention the following Philippine plank:

The Filipinos have succeeded in maintaining a stable government and have thus fulfilled the only condition laid down by the Congress as a prerequisite to the granting of independence. We declare that it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to these people by granting them immediately the independence which they so honorably covet.

And in 1932 the plank read:

We advocate independence of the Philippines.

In view of the continuous pledges of the Democratic Party now in control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States, and in view also of the persistent expression of wishes of the Filipino people to live an independent life at the earliest practicable time, there is nothing left but for the Congress to enact a law directing the President to proclaim and recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands immediately after the inhabitants therein have organized a government, or to enact a law along the lines suggested in the Concurrent Resolution No. 46 of the Philippine Legislature, to which I have referred.

The details of the transfer of American sovereignty to the Philippine independent government can be worked out by the Committee on Insular Affairs of this House and of the Senate in consultation with the constitutional representatives of the Philippines in the United States.

It is not out of place at this juncture to remind that the United States has assumed certain responsibilities in the grant of independence to the Filipino people that cannot in justice be avoided without betraying the trust that she assumed as an aftermath of the war against Spain.

While the grant of independence was and is the goal of American aim and purpose in the Philippines, the welfare and happiness of the inhabitants therein are also their main concern. The American flag was hoisted in the Philippines not as a symbol of conquest but as a token of a definite mission to be undertaken. The Philippines were not to be disposed of at the conqueror's pleasure or as his interests demand, but in accordance with certain principles of humanity and in harmony with the policy set forth since the inception of that occupation.

President McKinley in his exposition of the motives of the occupation in the Philippines said in the speech delivered at the Eleventh Annual Banquet of the Home Market Club, Boston, Mass., February 16, 1899:

LXXVIII—9

The evolution of events which no man could control has brought these problems upon us. Certain it is that they have not come through any fault on our own part, but as a high obligation, and we meet them with clear conscience and unselfish purpose, and with good heart resolve to undertake their solution.

He continued, saying:

The Philippines, like Cuba and Puerto Rico, were intrusted to our hands by the war, and to that great trust, under the providence of God and in the name of human progress and civilization, we are committed. It is a trust we have not sought; it is a trust from which we will not flinch.

And added:

Our concern was not for territory or trade or empire, but for the people whose interests and destiny, without our willing it, had been put in our hands.

In the light of this declaration of purpose, it becomes evident that the establishment of American sovereignty over the Philippine Islands was not founded upon the simple issue of whether independence should be granted. If the grant of independence were the only basis of the American occupation of the Philippines, it could have been accomplished either before the ratification of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States or after its ratification. Of course, annexation of the Philippines to the United States is out of the question. The two major parties of the United States; that is, the Republican and the Democratic Parties, are both committed to the proposition that the war against Spain was not for territorial aggrandizement or conquest, and much less for the subjugation and exploitation of a less fortunate people. The establishment of American sovereignty over the Philippines was founded upon high motives.

These were and are the humanitarian endeavors to be made by this Nation—

to secure for the Filipinos economic independence and to fit them for complete self-government, with the power to decide eventually, according to their own largest good, whether such self-government shall be accompanied by independence. (President Taft in his message to Congress on Dec. 6, 1912.)

It is my expectation that the Congress of the United States will solve the Philippine problem in a way satisfactory to the best interests of both countries. I am sure that the United States will fulfill her pledge to grant independence to the people of the Philippine Islands under conditions and circumstances that will not imperil their political, social, and economic stability.

For the best understanding of this House, I wish to submit, and therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, the Concurrent Resolution No. 46, of the Philippine Legislature. The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution informing the Congress of the United States that the Philippine Legislature, in its own name and in that of the Filipino people, declines to accept the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes", in its present form and appointing a committee to proceed to the United States at the earliest practicable time to seek amendments to said act of Congress or the enactment of such new legislation as will fully satisfy the aspirations of the Filipino people to become at the earliest practicable date a free and independent nation, under conditions and circumstances that will not imperil the political, social, and economic stability of their country

Whereas the Congress of the United States on the 17th day of January 1933, enacted a law entitled "An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes", commonly known as the "Hare-Hawes-Cutting law";

Whereas section 17 of said law provides that the provisions of the same "shall not take effect until accepted by concurrent resolution of the Philippine Legislature or by a convention called for the purpose of passing upon that question, as may be provided by the Philippine Legislature";

Whereas the Philippine Legislature fully appreciates the good will shown by the Congress of the United States toward the people of the Philippine Islands and its efforts to finally settle the Philippine question by enacting said law;

Whereas the Philippine Legislature believes that in providing that the said law shall not take effect until accepted by the Philippine Legislature or by a convention called for the purpose of passing upon that question, the Congress of the United States

intended to secure a frank and honest expression of the will of the Filipino people regarding the above-mentioned law; and

Whereas the Philippine Legislature is opposed to the acceptance of said law in its present form because, in the opinion of the legislature, the law does not satisfy the national aspirations, nor does it safeguard the welfare of the Filipino people or the stability of the social, economic, and political institutions of their country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the Philippine Senate concurring), That the Philippine Legislature, in its own name and in that of the Filipino people, inform the Congress of the United States that it declines to accept the said law in its present form because, in the opinion of the legislature, among other reasons, the provisions of the law affecting trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands would seriously imperil the economic, social, and political institutions of this country and might defeat its avowed purpose to secure independence to the Philippine Islands at the end of the transition period; because the immigration clause is objectionable and offensive to the Filipino people; because the powers of the high commissioner are too indefinite; and finally because the military, naval, and other reservations provided for in the said act are inconsistent with true independence, violate national dignity, and are subject to misunderstanding.

Resolved further, That a joint legislative committee of the senate and the house of representatives be appointed, as it is hereby appointed, subject to the directions, purposes, and authority herein stated, to be composed of the Honorable Manuel L. Quezon, president of the Philippine Senate, as chairman of the committee on the part of the Philippine Senate; the Honorable Quintin Paredes, speaker of the house of representatives, as chairman of the committee on the part of the house; Hon. Elpidio Quirino, majority floor leader of the senate; Hon. Jose C. Zulueta, majority floor leader of the house of representatives; Hon. Sergio Osmena, senator from the tenth district; and Hon. Pedro Guevara, Resident Commissioner to the United States, and that an invitation be, and is hereby, extended to Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, president of the erstwhile Philippine Republic; Hon. Juan Sumulong, former senator; and Hon. Isidro G. Guevara, former senator and Resident Commissioner, to join said legislative committee and form a part thereof, General Aguinaldo as honorary chairman and the others as members.

The committee thus constituted shall proceed to the United States as soon as convenient in the interest of the public service and convey to the Congress of the United States the appreciation of the Filipino people for the enactment of the law of Congress entitled "An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes."

The committee shall, at the same time, express to the Government and people of the United States the objections to the said law and the reasons therefor, and petition the President and the Congress of the United States for changes therein or the enactment of such new legislation as will fully satisfy the aspirations of the Filipino people to become at the earliest practicable date a free and independent nation, under conditions and circumstances that will not imperil the political, social, and economic stability of their country.

The Philippine Legislature approaches the Government and people of the United States through this committee in the hope and confident expectation that they will not ignore the appeal of the Filipino people—a people who, in the language of every American President since the inauguration of American rule, have been placed by Divine Providence under the protecting care of the American Nation so that they may enjoy the blessings of freedom and happiness which are the heritage of the people of the United States.

Adopted October 17, 1933.

The majority of the Philippine Legislature in passing Concurrent Resolution No. 46 declining to accept Public Act No. 311 acted in accordance with the specific provisions of section 17. This section gives the Philippine Legislature the right and privilege to accept or reject the law. In the exercise of this right granted by the Congress of the United States, Public Act No. 311 was not accepted.

I venture to say that the Philippine Legislature in adopting Concurrent Resolution No. 46 acted upon the belief and hope that the Congress of the United States would not be indifferent to a prompt solution of the Philippine problem in accordance with its wishes. It has taken into consideration the pledges of the Democratic Party now in power and based its action upon these pledges. These pledges are construed to mean that in the grant of independence provision should be made in such a way as to permit the Filipino people to maintain that independence by not thwarting their economic progress, attained through the leadership and generous assistance of the American people. The free-trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands were established in 1913 in the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act for the purpose of encouraging the economic de-

velopment of the Philippines in order that when the time came to grant its independence it might be in possession of some instrumentalities essential to the life of an independent government. The limitation fixed in the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law as to the amount of sugar and cordage that may be exported to the United States duty free is considered contrary to the avowed purpose of the United States, for it would mean the strangulation of the Philippine economic structure and, it is felt, would defeat the grant of independence. On the other hand, opinion here is that the Filipino people should stand courageously the initial difficulties of independence. While the Filipino people are prepared to sacrifice everything that is dear to them for the attainment of the ideals for which their forefathers fought in the past, yet it is their profound hope that as long as the United States has undertaken the mission of leading them to their place in the concert of nations, she will not ask of them sacrifices which may eventually cause their collapse, thus inviting some greedy nation to grab them. If this tragic eventuality becomes a reality, I am sure the United States would not be happy and proud of the deed, which should add to her history a glorious chapter of human endeavors. Even the economic calamity which is whipping every nook and corner of this the most powerful and wealthy Nation in the world would not be sufficient human excuse for the failure of Philippine independence. It is high time to remind that the Philippines have been kept under the American flag under her sole responsibility. Whether or not it is the consequence of party policy is out of the question. It should be construed as a national responsibility. The Democratic Party now in power speaks for the American people. Its policy as expressed in its platform, adopted in solemn convention in 1932, should be fully executed as far as it concerns the people of the Philippine Islands.

Before concluding, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to apprise the Congress of the United States that a committee of the Philippine Legislature, presided over by Manuel L. Quezon, president of the Philippine Senate, and the acknowledged leader of the Filipino people, is now present in Washington.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have fulfilled my duty as I see and understand it. I join cordially with this committee sent by the Philippine Legislature to the United States to enter into negotiations with the constitutional agencies of this Nation to settle once and for all the Philippine question in a way compatible with the responsibilities of the United States, whose honor has never been questioned, and in harmony with the best interests of the Filipino people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein Concurrent Resolution No. 46 of the Philippine Legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, my remarks on the pending bill will be very brief.

I simply want to make an explanation of the attitude taken on this bill by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee.

A subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee was appointed under a resolution adopted last June before the special session adjourned to study tax avoidance and any new tax matter that might come up. Realizing, of course, that repeal of the eighteenth amendment by the adoption of the twenty-first amendment was imminent, the first task that the committee undertook on its return here on the 23d of October was an effort to see whether or not we could suggest a satisfactory rate on distilled spirits that would bring a sufficient and satisfactory revenue to the Government and at the same time not play into the hands of the bootleggers.

We soon found it was very difficult to secure any expert advice or evidence. Through the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL, who has been tireless in his

efforts on behalf of the work of the subcommittee, we asked various people to come before us representing the Government. We waited for a day or more and found they were not available. We then found there had been authorized by the administration a so-called "interdepartmental committee" to study the very problem that we felt was a tax problem of the Congress, and the men we looked to for advice and assistance seemed to be either members of this committee or tied up to testify before them and, as I have said, were not available to us.

A little later we found that there was an evident move on the part of the administration to license distilleries and then set up a Government corporation that would buy from the distilleries all they were allowed to manufacture under their respective quotas, and then make an arrangement whereby the corporation would supply the States with their fair share of legalized liquor. Evidently this plan appeared to be impracticable and probably unconstitutional.

We then received the report of the interdepartmental committee, and that report recommended a method of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and also recommended a tax of \$2.60 per gallon. This tax was to include such allotment as the Government saw fit to make to the various States.

We then had some hearings and among our early witnesses was the gentleman who had been selected by the President to have charge of the quota importations by the various governments until Congress could legislate in the matter, Mr. Joseph H. Choate, of New York, an eminent lawyer, son of a former Ambassador to Great Britain, and a very distinguished statesman of a few years past. Mr. Choate was Administrator of the Federal Alcohol Control Board, and he testified he felt that unless it was practicable to get this arrangement between the States and the Federal Government, the rate of \$2.60 might be too high. He also stated it was probably a task requiring time to educate the States up to this agreement of an allotment being made by the Federal Government to the States. Attention was called to the fact that revenue would be lost by this delay. This was as far as that proposition went.

A little later members of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee were evidently invited to the White House and either the following morning, or the second morning after that small gathering, the proposition was presented that the tax on distilled spirits should be \$2 per gallon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I yield for a brief question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Speaking as a Democrat and one having some connection with this administration, I do not believe the White House ever said one word as to what the tax on distilled spirits should be, and I would not believe it unless it was absolutely proven to me.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did I say so?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, I believe the gentleman had the information, but I do not believe the White House ever uttered any such suggestion. The White House has been "sold" around here for a year.

Mr. TREADWAY. I should be pleased to have the reporter read exactly what I said. I did not say that any word was given to the committee from the White House as to what the rate should be, did I?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understood the gentleman to imagine—

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I did imagine.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That when the committee came back they were voting the President.

Mr. TREADWAY. We had a perfect right to imagine.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has a right to imagine it, but I do not believe it could be substantiated.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not try to substantiate it. I was not in the conference.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And no one in the conference could substantiate it.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is seeing red from some source. I did not intimate any such thing.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly, to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I clearly misunderstood my colleague and friend, if there was not at least a veiled intimation, that the White House, in a conference with certain members of the majority of the committee, had intimated what tax should be imposed. Was that what my friend intended me to understand?

Mr. TREADWAY. All I know about it, Mr. Chairman, is what I think would be regarded in court as circumstantial evidence. We had been sitting there for some little time, as you know, day in and day out, and when it came down to the point of what might or might not be a good rate to write into the bill, the press, one morning, announced that there had been a few members of the Ways and Means Committee at the White House the night before. I am not a lawyer, but nevertheless I am under the impression that this might be regarded as possibly circumstantial evidence that some intimation was made as to what would be a satisfactory rate.

But let me say that there was distinct evidence given by Mr. Choate that \$2.60, as recommended by the interdepartmental committee, was probably about 20 percent too high. So the representative of the administration before the Ways and Means Committee in open hearing practically said that \$2 was a good rate.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. To whom does the gentleman refer as the representative of the administration?

Mr. TREADWAY. The representative of the administration was Joseph H. Choate.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit a further suggestion, I desire to state that, so far as I know, the President himself—and I think I know what I am talking about—

Mr. TREADWAY. I know the gentleman does.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The President has neither approved or disapproved of the recommendations of the interdepartmental committee. The President made no intimation to me or, as far as I know, to any member of the Ways and Means Committee as to what tax was desired.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is perfectly satisfactory. Now, Mr. Chairman, to return to the history of the situation. The minority members of the Ways and Means Committee felt that we had not had submitted to us sufficient evidence, either from experts or officials of the Government, on which to base a fair opinion as to what this tax should be. Therefore, the nine members of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee informed the majority of the committee that we felt that the responsibility was upon them and we voted present twice and were not recorded either for or against any rate going into the bill on distilled spirits.

That is the attitude the minority members took, and I think it represents the feeling of the minority Members of the House. The feeling is that the majority having the authority should assume the responsibility. We do not know whether the rate is the proper one or not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman think that the minority having been duly elected to this body has some responsibility to procure enough revenue to balance the Budget?

Mr. TREADWAY. Balance the Budget! It is too late to go into that now. With an excess of expenditure of 7, 8, or 10 billion dollars, which we heard this morning over the President's signature, let us not talk about balancing the Budget from this tax or in any other way. We will talk about that a little later.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The minority is not concerned in the Budget?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not want to begin talking about the Budget at this late hour today. It is too serious a subject.

Mr. SNELL. As one member of the minority, I want to say that the figures have got so high that we cannot possibly comprehend them. With a proposition to spend \$10,000,000,000, it seems to me it requires considerable nerve to get up and talk about balancing the Budget.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not want to balance the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. Which budget is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. TREADWAY. We will talk about balancing the Budget later.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. McGUGIN. We all appreciate how difficult it is to ever be able to pin the present President down to a definite statement, and we have to depend to a great extent upon circumstantial statements. In support of what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has said, let me read from the President's own message read to this House today in the Budget, over his own signature:

However, if as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax on distilled spirits is increased from \$1.10 to \$2 a gallon, and the rates of taxation on wines are also increased, the estimated revenue will be increased by approximately \$50,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. And what would that do?

Mr. McGUGIN. Of course the President does not state that that is the amount he wants, but it stands to reason that he is most assuredly satisfied with it or in his own message he would be taking some exception to it, and his Budget message is based upon the estimate that that tax on liquor will be \$2 a gallon, and with that statement certainly the country has a right to accept the conclusion that the \$2 tax on liquor is Mr. Roosevelt's own tax, of his own choice.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield back the remainder of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back the remainder of his time and the gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, I think there is no one on this side who wants to address the Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want those 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to spend my time wastefully listening over the radio to a speech of harmony of our good friend BERT SNELL, the great minority leader of this House, saying he is going along harmoniously with the President and the rest of the country—

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. To get us out of this bog, and then see him now try to overwhelm our good friend from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], who is trying to hold his own on this bill, with all of these stupendous figures that he imagines.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. When the gentleman quotes me, I wish he would quote me correctly. I said I was going along with the President when his recommendations we believe were sound and for the best interests of the country. I never said that I was going along with him on everything.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman going along with him in his message he gave the other day?

Mr. SNELL. With some parts of it I am, and to some parts I am opposed.

Mr. BLANTON. And which parts are you not with him on?

Mr. SNELL. Oh, on a whole lot of them.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not talking to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas must confine himself to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. This talk is on raising \$50,000,000 in taxes to help balance the Budget of the country. I presume the gentleman's Republican Party on that side is interested in the Government and is interested in the stability of the Government's credit and in wanting to see the Budget balanced.

Mr. MILLARD. Oh, quite as much as is the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. All this bunk, all this folderol, all this political balderdash put across the aisle here the people are getting tired of. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BANKHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 6131, to raise revenue by taxing certain intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 5, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

245. A letter from the chairman of the United States Board of Mediation, transmitting copy of the seventh annual report of the Board of Mediation to Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

246. A letter from the president of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Washington, D.C., transmitting report to Congress of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

247. A letter from the president and chairman of the Board of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the annual report to Congress from the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., covering the activities of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, in Panama, together with statement of receipts and disbursements for the period November 1, 1932, to October 31, 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

248. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

249. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with the requirements of section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (U.S.C., title 5, sec. 264), a combined statement of the receipts and expenditures, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

250. A letter from the national legislative chairman of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, transmitting the minutes of the Thirteenth National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans held at Cincinnati, Ohio, June 25 to July 1, 1933, inclusive, to be published under authority of Public Resolution 126 of the Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed.

251. A letter from the vice chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting herewith the proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at Chicago, Ill., October 2 to 5, 1933, as provided in Public Resolution 126, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 2, 1931, for printing as a House document; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed.

252. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting herewith a letter from the Budget officer, Department of Justice, submitting report of vessels and vehicles seized under the National Prohibition Act, during the fiscal year 1933; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

253. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of section 6 (c) of the act of July 3, 1930 (Public, No. 536, 71st Cong.), the third annual report of activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed.

254. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting recommendations of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

255. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of the act of July 28, 1916, a report of all cases where special contracts are made with railroad companies for the transportation of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1358) granting an increase of pension to Clarence W. Failor, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H.R. 6355) to amend title II, section 203 (a) (2), chapter 67, public acts of Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREY: A bill (H.R. 6356) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River near Trenton, N.J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H.R. 6357) to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H.R. 6358) to make barley and grain sorghums basic agricultural commodities for the purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H.R. 6359) authorizing the sale of certain property no longer required for public purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H.R. 6360) to provide warrant officers of the Coast Guard parity of promotion with warrant officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H.R. 6361) to provide for the grading and paving of the part of Eighth Street, city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., and of a part of county Highway No. 307 of Cass County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H.R. 6362) to aid commerce; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H.R. 6363) to provide punishment for certain offenses committed against (member banks of the Federal Reserve System) banks organized under

laws of the United States, and banks located in the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and territories and possessions of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H.R. 6364) amending certain provisions of Public Law No. 2, and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, to provide compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H.R. 6365) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the executive offices and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H.R. 6366) making appropriation to restore water of high mineral content on land owned and controlled by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H.R. 6367) to promote education; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARLAND: A bill (H.R. 6368) to provide for the control of flood waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries; to provide for the irrigation, agricultural development, and terracing of lands in the Arkansas River watershed; to provide for the development of electrical power along the streams in such watershed; to provide for the reforestation of lands suitable therefor in such watershed; and to provide for the economic and social well-being of people living in the Arkansas River watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H.R. 6369) authorizing the payment of an indemnity to the Spanish Government on account of the death of Juan Neira, a Spanish subject, killed at Savannah, Ga., by a United States truck; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Nebraska: A bill (H.R. 6370) to extend time for completion of construction of bridge across Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut: A bill (H.R. 6371) to provide for guaranteeing the principal of bonds issued by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H.R. 6372) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, title 5, ch. 3), relating to building and loan associations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H.R. 6373) to relieve the unemployed and aid agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H.R. 6374) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the executive offices and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H.R. 6375) to authorize the payment of annuities withheld from employees retired from active service during the month of July 1932, under the provisions of the economy law; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H.R. 6376) to prevent the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, cosmetics, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H.R. 6377) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Peter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, no. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCANDLESS: A bill (H.R. 6378) providing for representation of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in the Senate of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H.R. 6379) to amend title 11, section 203 (a) (2), chapter 67, public acts of Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Resolution (H.Res. 211) to authorize and direct an investigation of the purchase of beans by the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 214) authorizing the Postmaster General to make a just and equitable compensation for the past use in the Postal Service of a certain invention and device for the postmarking of mail packages and for the more permanent cancelation of postage stamps during the time the said device was in use by the Post Office Department, not exceeding or going beyond the life of the letters patent thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STRONG of Texas: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 215) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the term of service of judges of United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 216) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Charles W. Eliot; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing Congress to pass an old-age persons pension law; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Government of Ilocos Norte, P.I., memorializing Congress for unconditional independence of the Filipino people; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMM: A bill (H.R. 6380) for the relief of Jonathan A. Steiner; to the Committee on Military Affairs. Also, a bill (H.R. 6381) for the relief of Joseph F. Gdaniec; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H.R. 6382) for the relief of John E. Little; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H.R. 6383) for the relief of Nellie T. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6384) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H.R. 6385) for the relief of the estate of Victor L. Berger, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARDEN of Kentucky: A bill (H.R. 6386) for the relief of Lucien M. Grant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLEY of New York: A bill (H.R. 6387) for the relief of Germania Catering Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6388) for the relief of Barnett Klass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H.R. 6389) for the relief of Rebecca J. Forrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 6390) for the relief of Minnie D. Hines; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H.R. 6391) for the relief of the children of William Wheeler Hubbell and his wife, Elizabeth Remley Hubbell, both deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H.R. 6392) for the relief of Carrie K. Currie, doing business as Atmore Milling & Elevator Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H.R. 6393) granting a pension to Flavia Felt Kile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H.R. 6394) for the relief of F. P. Bolack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H.R. 6395) granting a pension to Lydia Frances Nyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6397) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Shiffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6398) granting a pension to Harry A. Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6399) granting a pension to Mary Leslie Wunderlich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6400) granting a pension to Arthur C. Isenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6401) granting a pension to Anna Hill Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H.R. 6402) for the relief of Ernest F. Walker, alias George R. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6403) for the relief of William Thi-beault; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6404) for the relief of Gaston M. Janson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6405) for the relief of William H. Potter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6406) for the relief of William H. Connors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6407) for the relief of Edward Theroult, alias Frank Gamashe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6408) for the relief of George Henry Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6409) for the relief of Thelma Lucy Rounds; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6410) for the relief of Esther Fountain; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Manuel Ferreira; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6412) for the relief of John Leonard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H.R. 6413) granting a pension to Irene R. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H.R. 6414) for the relief of Joy Sturgis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN: A bill (H.R. 6415) to refund the duty on a carillon of bells imported by Grace Protestant Episcopal Church, Plainfield, N.J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H.R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6417) granting an increase of pension to Annie Messler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6418) granting an increase of pension to Emma Josephine Kelso; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6419) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Emily F. Dougall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6421) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6423) granting an increase of pension to Isabella B. McCandless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6424) granting an increase of pension to Safrona P. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6425) granting a pension to Abbie Stuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6426) granting a pension to Frances DuFrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6427) granting a pension to Emma B. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6428) granting a pension to Charles J. Fuhrer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6429) granting a pension to Oscar Linville; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6430) for the relief of the estate of George Evert Wever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6431) for the relief of Emma Berlet Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6432) for the relief of Mary E. McGerr; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6433) for the relief of Nettie B. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6434) for the relief of the heirs of Wells C. McCool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H.R. 6435) for the relief of Harry Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6436) for the relief of Lawrence Hyder; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6437) for the relief of Ruby L. Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6438) for the relief of George W. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6439) for the relief of Earl F. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6440) for the relief of Samuel G. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6441) for the relief of David C. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H.R. 6442) granting a pension to Annie B. Pott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6443) granting a pension to Elia Frees; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H.R. 6444) for the relief of Richard H. Bowman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6445) granting a pension to Sarah M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE: A bill (H.R. 6446) for the relief of Charles M. Marshall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H.R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Mary McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H.R. 6448) for the relief of James C. McCormick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TURNER: A bill (H.R. 6449) granting a pension to Jennie Wigfall Counce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H.R. 6450) granting a pension to Daniel W. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN: A bill (H.R. 6451) for the relief of Edward P. O'Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6452) for the relief of the Valley Forge Military Academy, Inc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H.R. 6453) for the relief of Grant Morrison; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6454) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Bouche; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6455) granting a pension to Minnie Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6456) granting a pension to Esther Critchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6457) granting a pension to Helen J. Selley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6458) granting a pension to Asa Ennes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6459) granting a pension to William Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1460. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of National Association of Letter Carriers at a convention held in Atlantic City, September 4-9, 1933, went on record favoring legislative relief for substitute letter carriers, and to that end urged the adoption of a bill introduced by Hon. James M. Mead, H.R. 4017; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1461. Also, petition of Pittsburgh Central Labor Union, urging the early repeal of title 2 of the Economy Act, which authorizes the salary reduction for governmental employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1462. Also, petition of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, endorsing the general principle and purpose of Senate bill 1944, introduced by Senator COPELAND, which will increase the scope of the Federal Food and Drugs Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1463. Also, petition of Charles D. McCoy Camp, No. 28, United Spanish War Veterans, Vincennes, Ind., urging the repeal of the Economy Act and the reinstatement of all veterans who at the time of the passage of the Economy Act were on the pension roll; also the restoration of all money due them by way of any reductions in their pensions since the passage of the act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1464. Also, petition of Sergeant Harry Wm. Steneck Post, No. 601, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Brooklyn, N.Y., urging the repeal of the Economy Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1465. By Mr. GLOVER: Petition of the citizens of Garland County, Ark.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1466. By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to protect American industry and the employees thereof against cheap foreign labor and products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1467. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, City of New York, opposing the so-called "Tugwell bill", in its present form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1468. By Mr. SPENCE: Petition of Kentucky Progressive Association for the Blind; to the Committee on Education.

1469. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Local Union No. 1831, United Textile Workers of America, Rome, Ga., protesting against reduction of wages of southern workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1470. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Tax Justice League of Indiana County, Pa., requesting the Congress to define by regular enactment: (1) The contemplated changes to be made in the gold dollar if the gold dollar is to be restored to the people; (2) the meaning of "commodity dollar"; and (3) the meaning of "managed dollar"; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1471. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Chicago, Ill., regarding a \$40,000,000 loan to the city of Chicago by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1472. Also, petition of the city of Dearborn, Mich., regarding world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1473. Also, petition of the New Deal Democratic Organization of Shreveport, La., regarding the congressional election in the Sixth District of Louisiana; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.